



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

**CR No.4334 of 2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-27.05.2026**

The Director Sant Longowal Institute of Engineering & Technology

.....Petitioner.

Versus

M/s Lion Services Ltd.

.....Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present:- Mr. Jagjot Singh Lalli, Deputy Solicitor General of India,
for the petitioner.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J. (ORAL)

CM-11328-CII-2026

Prayer in the present application, preferred under Section 151
CPC, is for placing on record documents (Annexures P-13 & P-14).

For the reasons set out in the application, the same is allowed.
The documents (Annexures P-13 & P-14) are taken on record, subject to all
just exceptions.

The Registry is directed to tag the same at an appropriate place
on the case file.

CR-4334-2026 (O&M)

The instant revision petition, preferred under Article 227 of
the Constitution of India, assails the order dated 10.03.2026 (Annexure

P-10) passed by the Court of Additional District Judge, Sangrur, vide which warrants of attachment to the extent of Rs.48,58,443/- were issued.

2. The facts, as emanating from the revision petition, are that an arbitral Award dated 08.03.2019 (Annexure P-1) was passed by the sole Arbitrator on arbitral proceedings having been initiated by respondent No.1. By way of the said Award, the following relief was granted:-

“53. As discussed above, there was a genuine dispute between the parties regarding the entitlement of the respondent to recover the amount paid as service tax during the period April, 2013 to March, 2017. So, the respondent was justified to withhold this amount of Rs.13,86,432/ till the dispute is settled. However, withholding of the remaining amount of Rs.13,15,031/- is unjustified and respondent is liable to pay interest on the above-said amount of Rs.13,15,031/ at the rate of 9% per annum from the day it became payable till the date of its realization.

54. The above-said amount of Rs.13,86,432/- (without interest) and Rs.13,15,031/- along with interest be paid within a period of four months from the date of the award failing which the claimant shall also be entitled to interest on the above said amount of Rs.13,86,432/- @ 9% from the date of award till the realization.

55. In addition to this, the claimant is also held entitled for cost of litigation and arbitration proceedings to the tune of Rs.1,00,000/-.”

3. Aggrieved by the said Award, a petition (Annexure P-2) under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (hereinafter referred to as the ‘1996 Act’) was filed. Learned counsel submits that

subsequently, an application under Section 36(2) of the 1996 Act was also filed.

4. The grievance put forth by learned counsel for the petitioner is that arguments in the petition under Section 34 of the 1996 Act were heard as far back as on 09.12.2025 whereafter, the matter is continuously being adjourned for orders. Reference has been made to the interlocutory orders passed during the said period. Learned counsel also submits that no orders were passed on the application under Section 36(2) of the 1996 Act as well. Learned counsel submits that pursuant to warrants of attachment having been issued in execution proceedings, the entire awarded amount stands deposited with the Executing Court. Learned counsel further submits that since the petition under Section 34 of the 1996 Act is at the stage of decision, the said amount be not disbursed to the respondent till its decision.

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

6. 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.

7. It is a matter of grave concern that for the last six months, the petition under Section 34 of the 1996 Act is being fixed for orders. The application under Section 36(2) of the 1996 Act has also not been decided. In the meantime, upon institution of execution proceedings, warrants of attachment have been issued.

8. As stated by learned counsel for the petitioner, the entire amount stands deposited with the Executing Court.

9. Since the Court of Additional District Judge, Sangrur, is seized of the petition under Section 34 as also the application under Section 36(2) of the 1996 Act and the matter is fixed for orders, the present revision petition is disposed of with a direction that till the decision of the petition under Section 34 of the 1996 Act, the amount be not disbursed to the decree-holder.

 A report be also called from the District Judge, Sangrur in this regard and be placed before the Administrative Judge of Sangrur Sessions Division on the Administrative side.

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

May 27, 2026
Yag Dutt

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

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