



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(1) CR No.147 of 2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 12.05.2026

Jagsir SinghPetitioner.
Versus
Union of India and othersRespondents.

(2) CR No.176 of 2025 (O&M)

Ajmer SinghPetitioner.
Versus
Union of India and othersRespondents.

(3) CR No.178 of 2025 (O&M)

Balour SinghPetitioner.
Versus
Union of India and othersRespondents.

(4) CR No.179 of 2025 (O&M)

Jaswinder SinghPetitioner.
Versus
Union of India and othersRespondents.

(5) CR No.180 of 2025 (O&M)

Shingara SinghPetitioner.
Versus
Union of India and othersRespondents.

***CR No.147 of 2025 (O&M) and
06 other connected cases***

-2-

(6)

CR No.181 of 2025 (O&M)

Joginder Singh

.....Petitioner.

Versus

Union of India and others

.....Respondents.

(7)

CR No.182 of 2025 (O&M)

Gurpreet Singh

.....Petitioner.

Versus

Union of India and others

.....Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present:- Mr. Ranjit Saini, Advocate and
Mr. Nitin Mehta, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in all cases).

Mr. Vibhor Bansal, Senior Panel Counsel with
Mr. Ishank Bansal, Advocate
for respondent No.1-UOI in CR-176, 178, 179 & 182-2025.

Mr. Lalit Attri, Advocate
for respondent No.1-UOI in CR-180 & 181-2025.

Mr. K.S. Kang, Advocate and
Ms. Khushi Bhatia, Advocate
for respondent No.2-NHAI (in all cases).

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J. (Oral)

1. This order shall dispose of the afore-titled 07 revision petitions, all assailing order dated 08.01.2025 passed by the Court of Additional District Judge, Ferozepur, vide which the application filed by respondents No.1 and 2 under Section 36(2) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (hereinafter referred to as the '1996 Act'), was dismissed.

2. With an intention to wider the National Highway No.71, a Notification under Section 3(A) of the National Highways Act, 1956 (hereinafter referred to as the '1956 Act') was published on 20.05.2014. Subsequently, the same was also published in 02 newspapers on 10.09.2014 and 11.09.2014. The land of the petitioner(s) falling in the revenue estate of Village Dharamkot, District Moga, was sought to be acquired. Proceedings under the 1956 Act were conducted and the Notification under Section 3(D) (1) & (2) was issued on 28.04.2014. The competent Authority announced the Award on 07.09.2015 pursuant to which, the Divisional Commissioner, Ferozepur, was appointed an Arbitrator to resolve the issue arising between the petitioner(s) and the respondents. Award dated 19.06.2020 was passed by the Divisional Commissioner.

3. The said Award was challenged by respondents No.1 and 2 under Section 34 of the 1996 Act (Annexure P-2). An application under Section 36(2) of the 1996 Act (Annexure P-3) was also filed.

4. Vide order dated 08.01.2025 (Annexure P-7), the said application was dismissed.

5. Aggrieved by the said order, the land owners have instituted the instant revision petitions.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) submits that on account of dismissal of the application under Section 36(2) of the 1996 Act, the land owners have been deprived of deposit of 50% of the amount which may have been deposited upon a condition being imposed by the Court and

the same could have been released to the land owners.

7. Per contra, learned counsel for respondents No.1 and 2 submit that the revision petitions are, in fact, not maintainable since the application under Section 36(2) of the 1996 Act was filed by respondents No.1 and 2 and not by the petitioner(s) and once they have been dismissed, the petitioner(s) are free to proceed in accordance with law. They further submit that the petition under Section 34 of the 1996 Act is pending before the Court of Additional District Judge, Ferozepur, but despite repeated opportunities, the petitioner(s) are not coming forward to address arguments on the same.

8. I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

9. Concededly, an Award had been passed. It is also an admitted fact that a petition under Section 34 of the 1996 Act has been instituted by respondents No.1 and 2 and the same is pending adjudication. Further, the application instituted under Section 36(2) of the 1996 Act stands dismissed vide the impugned order. It is quite strange that the said order has been assailed by the land owners and not by respondents No.1 and 2. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) has also apprised the Court that the entire compensation amount stands deposited before the Executing Court.

10. Having considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, this Court does not deem it appropriate to pass any orders in the instant revision petitions, insofar as the merits of the impugned order is considered since it was passed against respondents No.1 and 2 on an

application filed by them and not by the petitioner(s).

11. Insofar as the petitioner(s) are concerned, they can avail their remedies before the Executing Court. Further, respondents No.1 and 2 can press upon the Court concerned for an early decision on the application under Section 34 of the 1996 Act. This Court is sanguine that the Court concerned shall consider both matters in the right earnest and proceed in accordance with law so that the rights of none of the sides are prejudiced.

12. The Executing Court shall also consider the issue of release of the amount to the land owners, if so pressed, in accordance with law.

13. The petitions are, accordingly, disposed of.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

May 12, 2026
Yag Dutt

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*