



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

CR No.4082 of 2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision:-14.05.2026

State of Punjab and another

.....Petitioners.

Versus

M/s Aggarwal Constructions Company

.....Respondent.

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, assails the order dated 19.01.2026 (Annexure P-35) vide which the bank account of the petitioners has been attached. The petition also seeks the issuance of a direction to the Court 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.18 of 2021 titled as *State of Punjab v. M/s Aggarwal Construction Company and another* is pending, to decide the same in a time bound manner.

2. At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioners, on instructions, submits that he does not assail the order dated 19.01.2026 and only prays for the issuance of a direction to the Court concerned to dispose

of the petition under Section 34 of the 1996 Act, which had been instituted in March 2021 in a time bound manner since despite the lapse of 06 months, the matter has not been taken up for arguments even once and even the application under Section 36(2) of the 1996 Act has not been decided.

3. I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner and have gone through the interlocutory orders.

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

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 which will be defeated in case decisions are inordinately delayed.

6. The petition under Section 34 of the 1996 Act is stated to be pending since 2021. Almost five 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 of 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.18 of 2021 titled as ***State of Punjab v. M/s Aggarwal Construction Company and another*** is pending, to hear and decide the same within a period of four months from today.

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

May 14, 2026
Yag Dutt

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

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