



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

127

CR-4945-2026**Date of Decision: 03.07.2026**

ANIRUDH KUMAR

...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Akshay Bhan, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Saurabh Bajaj, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. Abhinav Kalia, DAG Haryana

Mr. Puneet Bali, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Kunal Vajani, Advocate and
Mr. Vipul Joshi, Advocate
for caveator/respondent No.2

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of order dated 16.05.2026 whereby Ld. Addl. District Judge, Faridabad has dismissed his application under Order XXI Rule 15(2) of CPC.

2. The petitioner undisputedly is one of the partners of respondent No.2-M/s Hydraulic and Pneumatic (India) LLP. He is having shareholding of 11.33%. The aforesaid entity is registered under Limited Liability Partnership Act, 2008. The State of Haryana in terms of provisions of Land Acquisition Act, 1894 acquired land of aforesaid entity. The State Government has deposited a sum of ₹120 crores

(approximately) with Executing Court. The respondent No.2 has filed execution application seeking release of aforesaid amount. The petitioner moved an application under Order XXI Rule 15(2) of CPC seeking protection of his interest. He primarily claimed that out of aforesaid amount of compensation, he should be paid 11.33% as per his share. Ld. ADJ by impugned order has rejected his application on the ground that land was owned by aforesaid entity, award was passed in its favour and appeal has been filed by it, thus, petitioner cannot be treated as joint decree holder in terms of order XXI Rule 15 of CPC.

3. Learned counsel for the parties on the asking of Court graciously agreed to the arrangement to the effect that respondent No.2- M/s Hydraulic and Pneumatic (India) LLP shall keep 5.5% of amount released by Executing Court in the form of FDR with any Bank and the petitioner would be free to move an appropriate application before Ld. Arbitrator before whom dispute between the parties is pending. The aforesaid arrangement would be without prejudice to rights and liabilities of the parties.

4. In the wake of statement of both sides, the petition stands disposed of.

5. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

July 03, 2026
Deepak DPA

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No