

**CR-1316-2026 (O&M)****-1-****114****IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH************CR-1316-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 21.04.2026**********

M/s Gill Steel Works

..... Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present: Mr. Gurkiran Singh, Advocate &
Ms. Ramita Puri, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

**********JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (ORAL)**

1. The present is a revision petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India for setting aside the impugned order dated 13.11.2025 (Annexure P-4) whereby learned learned Additional District Judge, Bathinda erroneously held that it lacked territorial jurisdiction and directed the return of the objections filed by the petitioner under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act') for presentation before the appropriate Court at Faridkot notwithstanding that the acquired land is situated in District Bathinda.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that by way of the impugned order dated 13.11.2025 (Annexure P-4), the objections under Section 34 of the Act filed by the National Highways Authority of India were directed to be returned for presentation before the Court at Faridkot on the ground that the Court at Bathinda lacked territorial jurisdiction. He submitted that the issue of territorial jurisdiction i.e. whether the Court at Bathinda or the Court at Faridkot has jurisdiction to entertain the objections under Section 34 of the Act



was pending before this Court in a bunch of Civil Revisions with the lead case being *C.R. No.3884 of 2023* titled “*Yashpreet Singh v. Union of India and another*”. These revision petitions have since been decided vide common order dated 20.04.2026, whereby it has been categorically held that the Court at Faridkot has territorial jurisdiction to entertain the objections under Section 34 of the Act and not Bathinda in such cases. Learned counsel fairly conceded that the ratio of the aforesaid judgment is squarely applicable to the facts of the present case.

3. In view of the facts noted above, the present revision petition is hereby dismissed.

21.04.2026	(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
Bhumika	JUDGE
1. Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
2. Whether reportable:	Yes/No