



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

119 + 299

**(1) CM-7142-CII-2025 in/and CR-318-2025
CM-7214-CII-2025 in/and CR-323-2025
Date of Decision: 07.05.2026**

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS AUTHORITY OF INDIA

...Petitioner

Versus

PARAMJIT KAUR AND ORS

...Respondents

**(2) CM-7214-CII-2025 in/and CR-323-2025
Date of Decision: 07.05.2026**

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS AUTHORITY OF INDIA

...Petitioner

Versus

PARAMJIT KAUR AND ORS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

**Present: Mr. K.S. Kang, Advocate
for the petitioner in both cases.**

Mr. Vikas Mehsempuri, Advocate for respondent No.1.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J. (ORAL)

1. In both afore-titled revision petitions, the petitioners assail the order dated 16.07.2024 passed by the Court of the Additional District Judge, Patiala (Executing Court), vide which the objections filed by the petitioners were dismissed primarily on the ground that no stay had been granted by the



Court of the Additional District Judge, Patiala, in the stay application moved under Section 36(2) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (hereinafter referred to as 'the 1996 Act').

2. On 20.01.2025, a coordinate Bench passed the following order:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that an application for stay of execution under Section 36(2) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (for short ‘the 1996 Act’) is pending before the Court where the petition under Section 34 of the 1996 Act challenging the award dated March 15, 2022 (Annexure P-1) is pending. The learned Additional District Judge, Patiala has not decided the stay application of the petitioner which was filed on May 31, 2022. Almost three years have passed since the stay application is pending. Without deciding the said stay application, he is now proceeding against the petitioner in EXE No.825 of 2022 filed by the award holder-respondent No.1.

Issue notice to the respondents.

In the meanwhile, the Additional District Judge, Patiala shall make an endeavour to decide the stay application of the petitioner (Annexure P-3) prior to the date fixed by this Court.

Let a status report be called from the concerned Court.

List on 08.04.2025.

A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of connected case.”

3. Today, vide CM-7142-CII-2025, CM-7214-CII-2025 and even otherwise, it has been pointed out that the stay application moved under Section 36(2) of the 1996 Act stands decided and against the said order,



petitioner has filed a separate revision petition.

4 Learned counsel for the parties are *ad idem* that in view of the same, the instant revisions have been rendered infructuous. However, learned counsel for the petitioner states that since the objections were dismissed primarily on the ground that there was no stay, it would be open for the petitioner to file objections afresh in the execution petition.

5. In view of the statement given by learned counsel for the parties, the present revision petitions are disposed of as having been rendered infructuous. Objections, if any, filed before the Executing Court by the petitioner shall be dealt with in accordance with law.

6. Photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

May 07, 2026
Nisha-1

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No