

109

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR-2411-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 21.04.2026

National Highways Authority of India Petitioner

Versus

Raj Kumar Respondent

CR-2451-2026 (O&M)

National Highways Authority of India Petitioner

Versus

Swaran Kanta Respondent

CR-2457-2026 (O&M)

National Highways Authority of India Petitioner

Versus

Balraj Singh Respondent

CR-2499-2026 (O&M)

National Highways Authority of India Petitioner

Versus

Damandeep Singh Respondent

CR-2508-2026 (O&M)

National Highways Authority of India Petitioner

Versus

Gurdeep Singh Sidhu Respondent

CR-2509-2026 (O&M)

National Highways Authority of India Petitioner

Versus

Raj Kumar Respondent

CR-2662-2026 (O&M)

National Highways Authority of India Petitioner

Versus

Pardeep Mangla Respondent

CR-2664-2026 (O&M)

National Highways Authority of India Petitioner

Versus

Pardeep Mangla Respondent



CR-2411-2026 (O&M) with connected cases

-2-

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present: Mr. Sanjay Kaushal, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Arjun Kaushal, Advocate,
Mr. Bhanu Kathpalia, Advocate &
Mr. Madhav Mehrotra, Advocate,
for the petitioner-NHAI.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (ORAL)

1. All the revision petitions have been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India for setting aside the impugned orders passed by learned Additional District Judge, Bathinda in execution petitions whereby conditional warrants have been issued against the Project Director, NHAI. These revision petitions are taken up together for final disposal.

2. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner-NHAI submitted that execution applications in all these cases were filed before the learned Additional District Judge, Bathinda, wherein the petitioner-NHAI is the judgment debtor and the respondents are the land losers/deed holders. He further submitted that against the awards, the petitioner filed objections under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act') before the Court at Bathinda and along therewith, applications under Section 36(2) of the Act seeking stay of the awards. However, 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*". The said civil revisions have now been decided vide common order dated 20.04.2026, whereby it has been 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.

**CR-2411-2026 (O&M) with connected cases****-3-**

3. Learned Senior Counsel further submitted that the limited prayer in these revision petitions is only to the extent that learned Executing Court at Bathinda is pressing hard for execution of the decrees by coercive methods and because of the non-adjudication of the applications under Section 36(2) of the Act due to the pendency of the aforesaid bunch of civil revisions wherein the issue of territorial jurisdiction was yet to be decided by this Court, the petitioner-NHAI could not deposit the awarded amounts before learned Executing Court. He thus prayed that now the objections under Section 34 of the Act along with the applications under Section 36(2) thereof are to be transferred to the Court at Faridkot, two months' time may be granted to the petitioners, with a direction to the Executing Court to refrain from taking coercive steps for the said period of two months. This would enable the petitioners to press their applications under Sections 36(2) and 36(3) of the Act before the Court at Faridkot.

4. I have heard learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner.

5. This Court in a bunch of Civil Revisions with the lead case i.e. ***Yashpreet Singh's case (Supra)*** has observed that the territorial jurisdiction to hear the objections under Section 34 of the Act in similar cases, wherein the land was acquired for construction of NH-15, lies with the Court at Faridkot and not at Bathinda. It was argued by learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner-NHAI that considering his limited prayer, the petitioners be protected only for a limited period of two months to the extent that no coercive steps may be taken against them, as the objections themselves would now be transferred in pursuance of the aforesaid judgment passed by this Court in ***Yashpreet Singh's case (Supra)***.

6. In view of the above, this Court is of the considered view that it

will be in the interest of justice if the aforesaid limited prayer of the learned Senior Counsel is accepted to the extent that the Executing Court shall refrain from taking any coercive steps against the petitioner for a period of two months from today.

6. Consequently, the present revision petitions are partly allowed. It is directed that, for the next two months only, no coercive steps shall be taken against the petitioners in the execution petitions pending against them. It is clarified that the aforesaid direction regarding non-taking of coercive steps shall be operative only for a period of two months and shall not be extended thereafter.

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