



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

**CR No.3886 of 2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-07.05.2026**

State of Punjab

.....Petitioner.

Versus

M/s Oasis Technocons Ltd. & another

.....Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present:- Mr. Somesh Arora, Addl. Advocate General, Punjab and
Ms. Shiny Chopra, AAG, Punjab.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J. (Oral)

The instant revision petition, preferred under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, seeks a direction to the Court concerned, where the petition under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (hereinafter referred to as "the 1996 Act") i.e. ARB case No.405 of 2019 titled as *State of Punjab v. M/s Oasis Technocons* is pending, to decide the same in a time bound manner.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the Award was passed by the Arbitrator as far back as on 22.08.2019, pursuant to which, a petition under Section 34 of the 1996 Act was instituted in the Court of District Judge, Mohali in 2019 itself. He submits that notice of motion was issued vide order dated 19.11.2019 and counsel for respondent No.1 caused appearance on 03.02.2020. Learned counsel submits that the matter is

thereafter being adjourned without any effective hearing. Learned counsel submits that on account of the pendency of the petition under Section 34 of the 1996 Act, grave prejudice is being caused to the petitioner as the execution petition is being pursued and the interest clock is also ticking.

3. I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner.

4. There would be no necessity of issuing notice to the respondents, for, in view of the nature of the order that is proposed to be passed, no prejudice would be caused to them.

5. This Court is conscious of the fact that Courts are already burdened with a large number of cases. It is neither possible nor fair to order time bound disposal in all cases. There are old cases, action plan cases and other cases which are to be given priority. At the same time, it is to be kept in mind that valuable rights of parties are involved in all cases and, therefore, Courts are duty bound to make every possible effort to deal with such issues expeditiously. The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 was brought into force with a purpose in mind.

6. After the Award having been passed on 22.08.2019, the petition under Section 34 of the 1996 Act is stated to be pending since 2019. Almost seven years have gone by. It is high time that petitions under Section 34 of the 1996 Act are heard and decided expeditiously, failing which the whole purpose enacting the 1996 Act would be defeated.

7. Keeping in view the peculiar facts of the present case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the Court concerned,

where the petition under Section 34 of the 1996 Act i.e. ARB case No.405 of 2019 titled as ***State of Punjab v. M/s Oasis Technocons*** is pending, to hear and decide the same within a period of four months from 13.05.2026 i.e. the date on which it is stated to be fixed for hearing, in accordance with law.

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

May 07, 2026
Yag Dutt

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

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