



**IN THE COURT OF 3RD ADDL. DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE,
AHMEDABAD [RURAL] AT AHMEDABAD**

ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION ACT, 1996 (U/s (s) 034,)

Exh.

CMA DC/71/2024	KANUBEN GOVINDBHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/204/2023	PATEL KARSHANBHAI KANJIBHAI [1] H P KADEL[1]-(G/1394/2018) V/S ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICERS OFFICE [1] PROJECT DIRECTOR SHREE, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[2]
With CMA DC/205/2023	DHULABHAI DAHYABHAI [1] H P KADEL[1]-(G/1394/2018) V/S ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICERS OFFICE [1] PROJECT DIRECTOR SHREE, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[2]
With CMA DC/206/2023	RAMESHBHAI MALUBHAI [1] H P KADEL[1]-(G/1394/2018) V/S ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICERS OFFICE [1] PROJECT DIRECTOR SHREE, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[2]
With CMA DC/207/2023	VANRAJSINH JORUBHAI [1] H P KADEL[1]-(G/1394/2018) V/S ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICERS OFFICE [1] PROJECT DIRECTOR SHREE, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[2]

With DC/208/2023	CMA	GHANSHYAMBHAI DHUDABHAI SOLANKI [1] V/S ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICERS OFFICE [1] PROJECT DIRECTOR SHREE, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[2]
With DC/209/2023	CMA	LEGAL HEIRS OF BHURUBHAI CHATURBHAI - BHAILALBHAI BHURUBHAI [1] V/S ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICERS OFFICE [1] PROJECT DIRECTOR SHREE, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[2]
With DC/210/2023	CMA	MAHESHBHAI SAVJIBHAI [1] H P KADEL[1]-(G/1394/2018) V/S ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICERS OFFICE [1] PROJECT DIRECTOR SHREE, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[2]
With DC/211/2023	CMA	VINUBHAI PRABHUBHAI MAKWANA [1] H P KADEL[1]-(G/1394/2018) V/S ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICERS OFFICE [1] PROJECT DIRECTOR SHREE, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[2]
With DC/212/2023	CMA	VAJUBHAI KANABHAI [1] H P KADEL[1]-(G/1394/2018) V/S ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICERS OFFICE [1] PROJECT DIRECTOR SHREE, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[2]
With DC/213/2023	CMA	JATUBHAI BHURUBHAI CHAUHAN [1] H P KADEL[1]-(G/1394/2018) V/S ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICERS OFFICE [1] PROJECT DIRECTOR SHREE, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[2]

With DC/214/2023	CMA	KHUMANSANG VIRSANGBHAI [1] H P KADEL[1]-(G/1394/2018) V/S ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICERS OFFICE [1] PROJECT DIRECTOR SHREE, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[2]
With DC/215/2023	CMA	BHARATBHAI ALIAS BHARATSINH SAMANTSANG [1] V/S ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICERS OFFICE [1] PROJECT DIRECTOR SHREE, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[2]
With DC/216/2023	CMA	LEGAL HEIR OF LEELABEN PAVANSANG - HARDEVSINH PAVANSANG CHAUHAN [1] V/S ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICERS OFFICE [1] PROJECT DIRECTOR SHREE, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[2]
With DC/217/2023	CMA	AJITSINH HEMSANG RUPSANG [1] H P KADEL[1]-(G/1394/2018) V/S ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICERS OFFICE [1] PROJECT DIRECTOR SHREE, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[2]
With DC/218/2023	CMA	NARANBHAI PITAMBARBHAI MAKWANA [1] V/S ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICERS OFFICE [1] PROJECT DIRECTOR SHREE, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[2]
With DC/219/2023	CMA	HEMUBHAI BHAGVANBHAI CHAUHAN [1] V/S ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICERS OFFICE [1] PROJECT DIRECTOR SHREE, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[2]

With DC/220/2023	CMA	DADA MANDIR ALIAS RADHAKRUSHNA H P KADEL[1]-(G/1394/2018) MANDIR TRUST THROUGH TRUSTEE PRABHATSANG JETHIBHAI [1] V/S ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICERS OFFICE [1] PROJECT DIRECTOR SHREE, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[2]
With DC/221/2023	CMA	SARVAIYA JAYENDRASINH GAMBHIRSINH [1] V/S ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICERS OFFICE [1] PROJECT DIRECTOR SHREE, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[2]
With DC/222/2023	CMA	SUKHDEVSINH BABUBHAI [1] H P KADEL[1]-(G/1394/2018) V/S ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICERS OFFICE [1] PROJECT DIRECTOR SHREE, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[2]
With DC/223/2023	CMA	RAGHAVJIBHAI DEVJIBHAI [1] H P KADEL[1]-(G/1394/2018) V/S ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICERS OFFICE [1] PROJECT DIRECTOR SHREE, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[2]
With DC/224/2023	CMA	UPENDRASINH SUKHDEVSINH [1] H P KADEL[1]-(G/1394/2018) V/S ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICERS OFFICE [1] PROJECT DIRECTOR SHREE, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[2]
With DC/225/2023	CMA	MANJUBEN AMARSHIBHAI WIFE OF DEVJIBHAI PATEL [1] V/S ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICERS OFFICE [1] PROJECT DIRECTOR SHREE, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[2]

With DC/226/2023	CMA	NARENDRASINH V/S JASMATSINH ALIAS JAHUBHAI [1] ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICERS OFFICE [1]
With DC/227/2023	CMA	CHAUHAN V/S PRABHATSANG JETHIBHAI [1] ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICERS OFFICE [1] PROJECT DIRECTOR SHREE, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[2]
With DC/228/2023	CMA	MAKWANA V/S GHANSHYAMBHAI PITAMBARBHAI [1] ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICERS OFFICE [1]
With DC/229/2023	CMA	CHAUHAN V/S LAKHUBHAI MADARSANG [1] ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICERS OFFICE [1] PROJECT DIRECTOR SHREE, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[2]
With DC/230/2023	CMA	BHARATBHAI V/S BHAGVANBHAI RAJPUT [1] ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICERS OFFICE [1] PROJECT DIRECTOR SHREE, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[2]
With DC/231/2023	CMA	JAYSHREEBEN V/S VALLABHBHAI [1] H P KADEL[1]-(G/1394/2018) [1] ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICERS OFFICE [1] PROJECT DIRECTOR SHREE, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[2]

With CMA DC/232/2023	ARVINDBHAI VALJIBHAI [1] H P KADEL[1]-(G/1394/2018) V/S ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICERS OFFICE [1] PROJECT DIRECTOR SHREE, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[2]
With CMA DC/233/2023	GANGUBHAI NANUBHAI VALA [1] H P KADEL[1]-(G/1394/2018) V/S ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICERS OFFICE [1] PROJECT DIRECTOR SHREE, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[2]
With CMA DC/234/2023	RAGHAVBHAI BHIKHABHAI [1] H P KADEL[1]-(G/1394/2018) V/S ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICERS OFFICE [1] PROJECT DIRECTOR SHREE, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[2]
With CMA DC/277/2023	JYANTIBHAI KARSANBHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/278/2023	JAGADISHBHAI SHAMJIBHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/279/2023	SAVJIBHAI DEVSIBHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]

With CMA DC/280/2023	MANIBHAI KHETABHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/281/2023	CHAMANBHAI KHETABHAI PATEL [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/282/2023	JORUBHAI BHAGVANBHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/283/2023	MAHIPATSANG DANUBHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/284/2023	VALJIBHAI KESRABHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/285/2023	LAKHUBHAI DANUBHAI GOHIL [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]

With CMA DC/286/2023	JYANTIBHAI KARSANBHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/287/2023	VINODKUMAR RATANSI PATEL [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/288/2023	MAHIPATSANG DANUBHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/289/2023	JAYANTIBHAI KARSANBHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/290/2023	MAHIPATSANG DANUBHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/291/2023	CHAMANBHAI KHETABHAI PATEL [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]

With CMA DC/292/2023	BABUBHAI VALJIBHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/293/2023	SHANTIBHAI VALJIBHAI PATEL [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/294/2023	KANTIBHAI VALJIBHAI PATEL [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/295/2023	RAJNISHBHAI SAVGANBHAI PATEL [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/296/2023	HARIBHAI VALJIBHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/297/2023	RAMESHBHAI CHANDUBHAI PATEL [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]

With CMA DC/350/2023	BHAVANBHAI HIRABHAI BHARVAD [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/351/2023	BHOPABHAI POPATBHAI BHARVAD [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/352/2023	GIRISHBHAI MOHANBHAI BHARVAD [1] V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/353/2023	DASHRATHBHAI JAKSIBHAI BHARVAD [1] V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/354/2023	BALVANSANG VAKHATSANG [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/355/2023	KANUBHAI GOVINDBHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]

With CMA DC/356/2023	RAMJIBHAI DANABHAI PATEL [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/422/2023	JAYNTIBHAI GAGABHAI BHARWAD [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/423/2023	PAMIBEN TE MOMANBHAI WIDOW [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/424/2023	KANTIBHAI DHARABHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/425/2023	KANTIBHAI DHARABHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/426/2023	KANUBHAI VAGHABHAI BHARVAD [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]

With CMA DC/427/2023	BABUBHAI VAGHABHAI BHARVAD [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/457/2023	BAGVANBHAI MANJIBHAI VEGDA [1] H B PATEL[1]-(G/498/1987) V/S THE PROJECT DIRECTOR,NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER,[2] THE ARBITRATOR AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR[3]
With CMA DC/459/2023	KANTIBHAI MOHANBHAI VEGDA [1] H B PATEL[1]-(G/498/1987) V/S THE PROJECT DIRECTOR,NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER,[2] THE ARBITRATOR AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR[3]
With CMA DC/460/2023	ISHWARJI BHIKHAJI THAKOR [1] H B PATEL[1]-(G/498/1987) V/S THE PROJECT DIRECTOR,NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER,[2] THE ARBITRATOR AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR[3]
With CMA DC/473/2023	VIJAY GANPATBHAI THAKOR [1] H B PATEL[1]-(G/498/1987) V/S THE PROJECT DIRECTOR,NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER,[2] THE ARBITRATOR AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR[3]
With CMA DC/72/2024	GAUTAMBHAI MANILAL THAKOR [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]

With CMA DC/73/2024	JITENDRAKUMAR NATWARBHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/74/2024	NAVALSANG BHIKHUBHAI VAGHELA [1] V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/75/2024	GHANSHYAMBHAI NARSANG [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/76/2024	JASHUBHAI AMBARAMBHAI PARMAR [1] V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/77/2024	CHANDABEN WD/O. BABUJI SOMAJI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/78/2024	VAJUBHAI GAFURBHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]

With CMA DC/79/2024	PRATAPBHAI FULABHAI CHAVDA [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/82/2024	GHANSHYAMSINH JESINGBHAI RATHOD [1] V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/118/2024	NATWARBHAI DAYABHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/119/2024	LEGAL HEIRS OF DECEASED BALDEVBHAI BECHARBHAI CHAUHAN [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/120/2024	RATILAL KHODAJI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/121/2024	BHUPATBHAI BABABHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]

With CMA DC/122/2024	MANILAL AATAJI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/123/2024	RAYSANGBHAI VAGHAJIBHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/124/2024	BHARATKUMAR MANUJI VAGHELA [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/125/2024	NAVALSANG BHIKHUBHAI VAGHELA [1] V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/126/2024	NAVALSANG BHIKHUBHAI VAGHELA [1] V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/127/2024	GAUTAMBHAI MANILAL THAKOR [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]

With CMA DC/128/2024	NAVALSANG BHIKHUBHAI VAGHELA [1] V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/129/2024	MAHENDRASINH PARBATSINH SISODIYA [1] V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/130/2024	KASHIBHAI KHENGARBHAI RATHOD [1] V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/131/2024	JASHUBHAI AMBARAM [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/132/2024	VAJUBHAI GAFURBHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/133/2024	NANDLAL MANILAL THAKOR [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]

With CMA DC/134/2024	HARISHANKAR CHANDULAL RAVAL [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/135/2024	MOBATSINH DANGSANGBHAI RATHOD [1] V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/136/2024	HARISHANKAR CHANDULAL RAVAL [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/137/2024	LALSHANKARBHAI JAYANTILAL [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/138/2024	JASHWANTBHAI MANILAL THAKOR [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/139/2024	AMBALAL CHAMANJI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]

With CMA DC/140/2024	MOBATSINH DANSANGBHAI RATHOD [1] V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/141/2024	HARISHANKAR CHANDULAL RAVAL [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/142/2024	AMARBA MAWUBHAI RATHOD [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/143/2024	LAKSHMIBEN NARANBHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/144/2024	LAKSHMISHANKAR CHANDULAL RAVAL [1] V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/145/2024	NARENDRABHAI ALIAS NARESHKUMAR KRUSHNLAL RAVAL [1] V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]

With CMA DC/146/2024	KANUBEN GOVINDBHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/147/2024	JITENDRAKUMAR NATWARBHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/148/2024	HANUBHAI MAVUBHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/149/2024	AMARBA MAVUBHAI RATHOD [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/150/2024	NATWARBHAI DAHYABHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/151/2024	HARISHANKAR CHANDULAL RAVAL [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]

With CMA DC/152/2024	RAMABHAI ALIAS RAMAJI GANDABHAI THAKOR [1] V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/153/2024	RAMANBHAI MAFATBHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/154/2024	LAKSHMIBEN NARANBHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/155/2024	NANDLAL MANILAL THAKOR [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/156/2024	MAHENDRASINH PARBATSINH SISODIYA [1] V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/157/2024	JASHUBHAI AMBARAM [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]

With CMA DC/158/2024	LAKSHMISHANKAR CHANDULAL RAVAL [1] V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/159/2024	JASHWANTBHAI MANILAL THAKOR [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/160/2024	VAJUBHAI GAFURBHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/167/2024	BHANUSHANKAR MANILAL RAVAL [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/168/2024	RAMANBHAI MAFATBHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/169/2024	RAMABHAI GANDABHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]

With CMA DC/170/2024	KHENGARJI JETHUJI ALIAS GHANSHYAMBHAI JETHUJI [1] V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/171/2024	MANILAL BHALABHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/172/2024	HANUBHAI MAVUBHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/173/2024	RUPAJI BANUJI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/174/2024	RUPAJI BANUJI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/175/2024	AMBALAL CHAMANJI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]

With CMA DC/176/2024	RUPAJI BANUJI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/177/2024	RUPAJI BANUJI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/178/2024	RAMANBHAI MAFATJI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/179/2024	RUPAJI BANUJI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/180/2024	LEGAL HEIRS OF DECEASED BUDHAJI MANGAJI CHAUHAN [1] V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/181/2024	NAVALSANG BHIKHUBHAI VAGHELA [1] V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]

With CMA DC/182/2024	GHANSHYAMBHAI JETHUJI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/215/2024	JASHUBHAI AMBARAM [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/216/2024	RAMABHAI ALIAS RAMAJI GANDABHAI THAKOR [1] V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/217/2024	BALVANTBHAI KHENGARBHAI RATHOD [1] V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/218/2024	MANOHAR AMBALAL THAKOR [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/219/2024	KUSUMBEN MANOHARBHAI THAKOR [1] V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]

With CMA DC/220/2024	MANOHAR AMBALAL THAKOR [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/221/2024	MANOHAR AMBALAL THAKOR [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/222/2024	MANILAL BHALABHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/223/2024	MADHUBEN ARJANJI VAGHELA [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/224/2024	RAMANBHAI MAFATBHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/225/2024	KANTIJI MANGAJI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]

With CMA DC/226/2024	MANOHAR AMBALAL THAKOR [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/227/2024	MANOHAR AMBALAL THAKOR [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/228/2024	AMBALAL CHAMANJI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/229/2024	LILABEN VISHNUBHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/230/2024	RAMANBHAI MAFATBHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/231/2024	RAMILABEN PRAHLADJI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]

With CMA DC/238/2024	MANILAL BHALABHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/239/2024	RUPAJI BANUJI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/240/2024	MANOHAR AMBALAL THAKOR [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/241/2024	RUPAJI BANUJI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/242/2024	RUPABEN BUDHAJI THAKOR [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/243/2024	GHANSHYAMBHAI NAARSANG [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]

With CMA DC/244/2024	MANOHAR AMBALAL THAKOR [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/245/2024	MANOHAR AMBALAL THAKOR [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/246/2024	MADHUBEN ARJANJI VAGHELA [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/247/2024	MANILAL BHALABHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/248/2024	KANTIJI MANGAJI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/359/2024	BHIKHABHAI SHAKRAJI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]

With CMA DC/360/2024	ALPESHBHAI GOVINDBHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/361/2024	ALPESHBHAI GOVINDBHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]
With CMA DC/362/2024	LAKSHMIBEN WIFE OF DAHYABHAI [1] P C SHAH[1]-(G/345/1990) V/S ARBITRATOR (DHOLERA EXPRESS HIGHWAY-751) AND DISTRICT COLLECTOR . [1] COMPETENT AUTHORITY (NH-751) AND ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAQ OFFICER SHREE[2] PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA[3]

COMMON JUDGEMENT

1. The present applications have been filed by applicants who are persons who owned agricultural land situated in Village Kavitha (Taluka Bavla) with villages Kariyana, Kesargadh, Jalalpurgodhaneshwar, Lana, Sarandhi, Vasna Chacharvadi, Juval Rupawati, Chaloda, Ruggadh, Bhat, Vejalka, Bholad, etc. (Taluka Dholka), District Ahmedabad, and some portion of which land has been acquired by the Central Government under provisions of the Highways Act for construction of national highway under provisions of the National Highways Act, 1956. Challenge in all these applications is to the self-same award made by the District Collector, Ahmedabad, who has been appointed as an Arbitrator by the Central Government, for the purpose of determining the compensation payable for acquisition of land. The common grievance voiced in these applications is that the market value assessed by the learned Arbitrator is less and the prayer is for granting enhanced amount of compensation for the acquired land. Respondent is the Competent Authority appointed by the Central Government, the District Collector, Ahmedabad who has been appointed by the Central Government to act as Arbitrator for determination of compensation payable for land acquired under provisions of the Highways Act and NHAI authority constituted under the National Highways Authority of India Act, 1988, and delegated with the development,

maintenance, and management of national highways across the country as are entrusted to it by the Central Government. The brief facts are that,

Ahmedabad - Dholera Expressway (National Highway 7.51), a greenfield highway being constructed by the National Highways Authority of India, upon this national highway being entrusted to it by the Cen Government. A stretch of the expressway passes through Villages as above, in District Ahmedabad. The lands falling in the alignment of the highway, as it passes from Villages, came to be acquired by the Central Government under provisions of the National Highways Act, 1956. There is no challenge to the acquisition of land. The Competent Authority appointed under the Highways Act is entrusted with the task of initial determination of the total amount of compensation payable for the acquisition of the land. The Competent Authority, after hearing the parties and taking into consideration the material produced by them, assessed the market value of the acquired agricultural land at Rs. 205/-, 209/- and 234/- per square meter depending upon the location of the land and determined the compensation for trees and other losses that may be incurred by the persons whose lands came to be acquired by his order dated 1.09.2019. The compensation determined by the Competent Authority came to be deposited by the National Highways Authority of India for and on behalf of the Central Government and the said amount has been disbursed to the persons entitled to receive the same as per law. As per Sub-section (5) of Section 3-G of the Highways Act provides that if any person is not satisfied with the amount of compensation determined by the Competent Authority, then such party may apply for judicious determination of compensation by an arbitrator to be appointed by the Central Government. Applicants did not find the market value of the agricultural land and the total amount of compensation determined by the Competent Authority to be satisfactory. They, accordingly, made an application for a fresh determination of compensation before the arbitrator, and the same came to be registered as Arbitration Case. The arbitrator made a common arbitral award. The arbitrator, on a request by the land losers (private respondents herein) picked the jantri rate which was the highest for any parcel of land in the entire villages and uniformly applied the said highest rate of jantri to all the acquired lands ignoring their individual jantri rate or their locational position in comparison to the land having the highest notified jantri rate and thereafter added a 5% year-on-year increase to such highest jantri rate for the purpose of determining the total amount of compensation payable for all the acquired lands in Villages.

2. Heard learned Advocate for the applicants in each of these applications, Mr. Maulik Nanavati with Ms. Manvi Damle, learned Advocates for the National Highways Authority of India and Mr. P M Trivedi, the learned Government Pleader for the Competent Authority.

3. Learned Advocates have advanced arguments and have submitted that the same arguments may be considered as submissions in all the other applications. Accordingly, as all the applications involve similar legal issues they are being decided by this common judgment. The Ld Advocate Mr. P C Shah has argued that, regarding the acquisition of disputed land owned by us, under the National Highways Act, 1956 (hereinafter referred to as the "Act of 1956") for short. 3G (3) vide public notice bearing no. 3 issued by us under sub-section 5 of the said Act before suit No.2. Our objections filed within the time limit which are filed by us along with the list of documentary evidence have been submitted. In the present case the amount of compensation has been illegally and artificially fixed unilaterally by the arbitrator in flagrant violation of all the provisions of law which were compulsorily to be followed. Without giving any opportunity to the petitioners to be heard, arbitrator fixed the compensation of the lands arbitrarily acquired, at which time the legal provisions were not taken into consideration and without taking into account the market value of the land, loss to the farmer etc. No mandatory procedure was followed. The act of NHAI remains illegal, because as per the provisions of the said Act, after the award of payment of additional compensation by opponent No.1, the additional difference amount was to be paid to the petitioners without any delay, but in the present case, opponent No.3 has not paid such difference amount till date and So, it is urged to pay the difference amount to the applicants immediately after passing the appropriate order. The market value of the buildings constructed on the land should have been determined by a competent engineer or a person having similar skills and the assessment of the compensation for the loss of trees etc. grown on the land should have been done by a competent experienced person and the assessment of the loss of standing crops on the land also had to be done by a competent experienced person. Also as per provisions, an amount equal to 100% of the land compensation amount determined by the authority after following all procedures of law, but, no such procedure was followed in the present case as "compensation of damages" was to be imposed. An amount equal to 50% of the compensation amount as fixed u/s 27 was to be paid to the affected families as resettlement and rehabilitation expenses such that no amount was admissible to the petitioners in the present case. Thus, the petitioners not being satisfied with the decision, are compelled to appear. That the case was proceeded before the parties and after considering the submissions of the parties and the documentary evidence, the claim of the petitioners was partially accepted. Being aggrieved by the aforesaid impugned award, we petitioners filed present petition under the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (hereinafter referred to as "the Act of 1996") U/s. 34. The orders passed/decisions taken/compensation amounts fixed by the parties in this case are prima facie illegal, contrary to principles of morality and justice and contrary to record as discussed above and for judicial reasons to be presented hereinafter. The applicant relies on the case of R. S. JIWANI of the Full Bench of the Hon'ble Bombay High Court; HATHWAY CABLE & DATACOM

PRIVATE LIMITED VS IRCON INTERNATIONAL LTD AND ORS (2009 LawSuit(Bom) 1621). It is argued that, it is held that, the principle of severability is applicable in a case and if the circumstances are found to be divisible into good part and bad part of the arbitration award, under sub-section 4 of Section 34, the good part was retained and the bad part was referred to the arbitrators for re-decision within a specified time frame with a view to correcting the error in accordance with the provisions of the said Act. It is held that the amount of compensation has been set low by authority and it is ordered to increase the amount of compensation partially, if it is considered as good part, some other things which have been stated in our original application and in the written argument, the market value of the land has not been properly determined (only the jantri has been taken into consideration, but it is much more than the jantri rate fixed by the government in the year 2011 Rs. 1757/sq. mtr. At a lower rate). Further as discussed above the provisions of the Act of 1956 and the Act of 2013 have been assessed as bad part of the statutory damages as per the judgment of the Hon'ble Bombay High Court and the same amount of the award to the petitioners. The petitioners pray that it is in the larger interest of justice that an order for prompt payment and thereafter order a re-determination within a fixed time frame with a view to remedying the bad part i.e. the legal defects as discussed and for that also please entertain the present application. If any award is found to be non-speaking or without findings and if in such circumstances the award is not in accordance with Act, in such circumstances the basic objective of enacting the said Act becomes futile. Applicants pray that an order to uphold the good part and re-determine the bad part for damages as per the discussion is lawful and in support of our contention applicants refer to the separate list from the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in M/S DYNA TECHNOLOGIES PVT LTD VS M/S CROMPTON GREAVES LTD (2019 LawSuit(SC) 2026). Applicants further submit that the judgment given by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of I-PAY CLEANING SERVICES PRIVATE LIMITED VS ICICI BANK LIMITED (2022 LawSuit(SC) 3) is applicable in that case. It is prayed to pass the appropriate judicial order to remove the defects found in the impugned award with the sole intention of keeping the good part of the impugned award intact and keeping in good faith all the evidence and instrumental documents that the impugned award was passed by the respondents no.1 without considering the evidence on record. Applicants further submit that, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAYS NO. 45 E & 220, NATIONAL HIGHWAYS AUTHORITY OF INDIA VS M. HAKEEM & ANR. (2021 LawSuit(SC) 369) under the Act of 1956 the arbitrator is appointed by the Central Government which It is obvious that the Government is acting in such a way as to get the maximum benefit financially and in such a situation there is full apprehension of injustice to persons like the petitioner and so even in such a situation the Hon'ble Court has upheld that the court can interfere with the arbitration award whereas in the present case as discussed

above the said award suffers from serious defects of that law and so with a view to removing such defects, intervene in the impugned award and pass an appropriate judicial order. Further, the Hon'ble Delhi High Court in AMAZING RESEARCH LABORATORIES LIMITED VS KRISHNA PHARMA (2023 LawSuit(Del) 1043), has elaborately discussed under which circumstances the award should be set aside and under which circumstances the bad part of the award i.e. the bad part should be sent back to the Arbitrator for reconsideration and therefore we humbly believe that the good part of the award should be maintained as discussed above and the bad part should be sent back to rectify the damage within the time limit. Applicants further further submit that, the Hon'ble Gujarat High Court NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA VS RAJENDRAKUMAR RAMESHABHAI PATEL (F.A. 44 OF 2024) order dt 01/02/2024 held that in the present cases even after a reading of the petitions filed, it was prayed to set aside the arbitrator's award and if Under such circumstances, if such an act is accepted, we the applicants and other farmers will have to suffer an immense loss which cannot be compensated in money and so please accept the present application. The applicant and other farmers like the petitioner have to suffer minimum economic and social loss before and after acquisition of the land whereas in the present case if we keep in view all the documentary evidences presented by us and the principles of law, the act of opponent is illegal and is against the provisions of law as well as the established principles so that even the present application of our petitioners deserves to be accepted. Applicants further further submit that keeping in view the details of the petition and the reasons given therein as well as the documentary evidence submitted and the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the Hon'ble High Court as well as the legal provisions, upheld the amount of compensation admissible in the impugned award and justly ordered the immediate payment of such amount and the impugned award, kindly pass such judicial order that the present directing a certain time limit for rectifying the defects pointed out in the impugned award and such other defects as you may think fit in accordance with the provisions of law in the larger interest of justice.

Mr. H P Khadel, Ld. Advocate for the applicant, has also relied on the above citations and argued that, the petitioner and other farmers have to suffer minimum economic and social loss before and after acquisition of the land, in the present case, if we keep in view all the documentary evidences presented by us and the principles of law, the act of opponents is illegal and is against the provisions of law as well as the established principles so that even the present application of our petitioners deserves to be accepted. It is further stated that the Jantri rates of the property were last fixed in the year 2011 as per the existing provisions of the Govt have been done and subsequently amended in 2023 and new Jantri rates have been implemented and to apply the indexation formula to the land acquired during such period as per the circular the land acquisition compensation has to be paid with an increase of 10% of the existing Jantri rate which also according to this case are not treated and therefore the present application of applicant deserves to be accepted

and keeping in view the details of the petition and the reasons given therein as well as the documentary evidence submitted and the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the Hon'ble High Court as well as the legal provisions, upheld the amount of compensation admissible in the impugned award and justly ordered the immediate payment of such amount and the impugned award, it is prayed to pass such judicial order that the present case should be returned to the applicants subject to a certain time limit for rectifying the defects pointed out by us in the impugned award and such other defects as you may think fit in accordance with the provisions of law and the present work should be maintained at the present stage till the defect is rectified by the applicants.

4. Learned Advocate appearing for the National Highways Authority of India, Mr. Maulik Nanavati, has made the following submissions:

- The arbitral award, impugned in the applications, is legal, just and proper and does not call for any interference by this Court.
- The learned Arbitrator has taken into consideration the documentary material produced on record by the parties and other evidence available on record of the case. The conclusion of the learned Arbitrator is based on cogent material, and the same does not suffer from any illegality or perversity.
- The arbitral award is not illegal or erroneous in law in as much as the conclusion recorded by the learned Arbitrator is not contrary to the substantive provisions of law relating to manner and method of determining compensation payable for acquisition of land and does not conflict with public policy.
- The arbitral award is not induced or affected by fraud or corruption. Such is not even the case of any party.
- The arbitral award is not in contravention of the fundamental policy of Indian law nor does it conflict with most basic notions of morality and justice. No argument has been advanced by the applicants showing or even suggesting that any statutory provision has been breached or the conclusion offends any legal proposition or provision of law.
- The learned Arbitrator has assessed the market value by taking into consideration the parameters prescribed in the National Highways Act, 1956 as also the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013. No error can be said to have been committed by the learned Arbitrator in assessing the market value of the acquired land and determining the compensation payable for the acquisition of land.
- The learned Arbitrator has granted the benefit of cumulative escalation in the market price as per principles of law enunciated in various judicial opinions, and the grant of 5% year-on-year increase cannot be said to be erroneous or illegal or contrary to law. There is no absolute proposition of law that the cumulative increase must be 10% year-on-year; such increase is dependent upon fact situation obtaining in each case.
- The scope of judicial review while entertaining an application under Section 34 of the Arbitration Act is limited. It is not open for the Court to reassess and reappraise the

evidence or enter into the merits of the case and re-assess the market value of the acquired land, as is being requested by the applicants.

- The Court while hearing the application under Section 34 of the Arbitration Act cannot independently assess the market value of the land by referring to the evidence on record as that would amount to substituting the arbitral award which is impermissible in law. Therefore, the prayer of applicants for enhancing the market value cannot be accepted and is liable to be rejected.
- The contention of the applicants that the learned Arbitrator ought to have taken into consideration the highest market value of the land in the village is fallacious. The highest market value of any land in the village cannot be made basis for determining the market value of the acquired land, more so without considering the location, characteristics and other relevant factors of such land. Any mechanical application of highest market value of any land in the village, ignoring the facts which enhance the value of such land, to all the other acquired land irrespective of their location, size, characteristics, etc. would be erroneous and demonstrate commission of manifest illegality.
- Even if a second view is possible on a reading of the evidence on record, then also the Court should not interfere with the arbitral award.
- The reliance placed by the applicants on paragraphs 49 and onwards of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of National Highways Authority of India vs. M. Hakeem, reported in (2021) 9 SCC 1, is misplaced and suffers from improper understanding of law. In the said case, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, after referring to earlier decisions, has observed in paragraph 31 that "there can be no doubt that given the law laid down by this Court, Section 34 of the Arbitration Act, 1996 cannot be held to include within it a power to modify an award" and emphatically declared in paragraphs 42 and 48 that the Court hearing an application under Section 34 of the Arbitration Act does not have the power to alter or modify an arbitral award; the limited option available to the Court is to accept the award or set aside the award. This is the *ratio decidendi* of the case. After having declared the law, which is binding as per Article 141 of the Constitution of India, 1950 and mandatorily required to be followed by the Civil Court, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in exercise of its power under Article 142 has chosen not to interfere with the orders passed by the High Court modifying the arbitral award and enhancing the amount of compensation. Such inherent power to do wholesome justice is alien to jurisdiction of the Civil Court while hearing and deciding an application under Section 34 of the Arbitration Act. Reliance is placed on the decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of Larsen Air Conditioning and Refrigeration Company vs. Union of India [2023 SCC Online SC 982] and S V Samudram vs. State of Karnataka [(2024) 3 SCC 623], to strengthen the contention that it is not open for the Civil Court to enhance the amount of compensation by modifying the arbitral award.

Learned Advocate for NHAI has further submitted that the present applications be dismissed by the Court confirming the arbitral award.

- Dyna Technologies – (2019) 20 SCC 1 – paragraphs 24, 25
- Reliance Infrastructure vs. State of Goa – (2024) 1 SCC 479

5. The following points that would arise for my consideration are:

(1) Whether petitioner in has made out sufficient grounds under Section 34 of Arbitration and Conciliation Act to set aside the arbitral award?

(2) What order or award?

My findings on the above points are:

Point No.1 : In the negative

Point No.2 : As per final order

REASONS

6. Heard, perused case record and documents produced by the parties. Before proceeding further this court would like to reproduce herein provision of Section 33 & 34 of Arbitration Act for the ready reference as per which necessary provisions have been made for correction and interpretation of any award before the Ld. Arbitral Tribunal under Section 33 and subsequently necessary provisions have been made regarding any application to set aside any arbitral award.

"SECTION 33 : Correction and interpretation of award; additional award.

1) Within thirty days from the receipt of the arbitral award, unless another period of time has been agreed upon by the parties—

(a) a party, with notice to the other party, may request the arbitral tribunal to correct any computation errors, any clerical or typographical errors or any other errors of a similar nature occurring in the award;

(b) if so agreed by the parties, a party, with notice to the other party, may request the arbitral tribunal to give an interpretation of a specific point or part of the award.

(2) If the arbitral tribunal considers the request made under sub-section (1) to be justified, it shall make the correction or give the interpretation within thirty days from the receipt of the request and the interpretation shall form part of the arbitral award.

(3) The arbitral tribunal may correct any error of the type referred to in clause (a) of sub-section (1), on its own initiative, within thirty days from the date of the arbitral award.

(4) Unless otherwise agreed by the parties, a party with notice to the other party, may request, within thirty days from the receipt of the arbitral award, the arbitral tribunal to make an additional arbitral award as to claims presented in the arbitral proceedings but omitted from the arbitral award.

(5) If the arbitral tribunal considers the request made under sub-section (4) to be justified, it shall make the additional arbitral award within sixty days from the receipt of such request.

(6) The arbitral tribunal may extend, if necessary, the period of time within which it shall make a correction, give an interpretation or make an additional arbitral award under sub-section (2) or sub-section (5).

(7) Section 31 shall apply to a correction or interpretation of the arbitral award or to an additional arbitral award made under this section.

SECTION 34 : Application for setting aside arbitral award

(1) Recourse to a Court against an arbitral award may be made only by an application for setting aside such award in accordance with sub- section (2) and sub-section (3).

(2) An arbitral award may be set aside by the Court only if-

(a) the party making the application furnishes proof that-

(i) a party was under some incapacity; or

(ii) the arbitration agreement is not valid under the law to which the parties have subjected it or, failing any indication thereon, under the law for the time being in force; or

(iii) the party making the application was not given proper notice of the appointment of an arbitrator or of the arbitral proceedings or was otherwise unable to present his case; or

(iv) the arbitral award deals with a dispute not contemplated by or not falling within the terms of the submission to arbitration, or it contains decisions on matters beyond the scope of the submission to arbitration: Provided that, if the decisions on matters submitted to arbitration can be separated from those not so submitted, only that part of the arbitral award which contains decisions on matters not submitted to arbitration may be set aside; or

(v) the composition of the arbitral Tribunal or the arbitral procedure was not in accordance with the agreement of the parties, unless such agreement was in conflict with a provision of this Part from which the parties cannot derogate, or, failing such agreement, was not in accordance with this Part; or

(b) the Court finds that-

(i) the subject-matter of the dispute is not capable of settlement by arbitration under the law for the time being in force, or

(ii) the arbitral award is in conflict with the public policy of India.

Explanation 1. For the avoidance of any doubt, it is clarified that an award is in conflict with the public policy of India, only if,

(i) the making of the award was induced or affected by fraud or corruption or was in violation of Section 75 or Section 81; or

(ii) it is in contravention with the fundamental policy of Indian law; or (iii) it is in conflict with the most basic notions of morality or justice.

Explanation 2. For the avoidance of doubt, the test as to whether there is a contravention with the fundamental policy of Indian law shall not entail a review on the merits of the dispute.

(2-A) An arbitral award arising out of arbitrations other than international commercial arbitrations, may also be set aside by the Court, if the Court finds that the award is vitiated by patent illegality appearing on the face of the award. Provided that an award shall not be set aside merely on the ground of an erroneous application of the law or by reappreciation of evidence.

(3)

(4).....

(5).....

(6)....."

7. An arbitral award can be set aside only on the grounds mentioned under Section 34 and not otherwise. An arbitral award can be set aside when it is in conflict with public policy of India, which includes not in compliance with statutes and judicial precedents, passed without judicial approach, not complying with the principles of natural justice, unreasonable, affected with patent illegality, in contravention of any statute including Arbitration Act, Contract Act etc. Patent illegality in the arbitral order, howsoever must go to the roots of the matter pending before the arbitrator and the violation of public policy indisputably should be so unfair and unreasonable as to shock the conscience of the Court hearing the application to challenge the arbitral order. Matters where the arbitrator has gone contrary to or beyond the express law of contract or has granted relief in the matter not in dispute would also come within the purview of Section 34 of the Act.

8. The provisions of Section 34 of the Arbitration Act, 1996, have been discussed in detail in case of '**ONGC v. Saw Pipes**', 2003 (5) SCC 705, as per which it is held that

"The result would be - award could be set aside if it is contrary to:

(a) Fundamental policy of Indian law; or

(b) The interest of India; or

(c) Justice or morality, or

(d) in addition, if it is patently illegal."

It is also further held that "Illegality must go to the root of the matter and if the illegality is of trivial nature it cannot be held that award is against the public policy. Award could also be set aside if it is so unfair and unreasonable that it shocks the conscience of the court. Such award is opposed to public policy and is required to be adjudged void."

It is also further held that

"In the result, it is held that:

(A) (1) The court can set aside the arbitral award under Section 34(2) of the Act if the party making the application furnishes proof that:

(i) a party was under some incapacity, or

(ii) the arbitration agreement is not valid under the law to which the parties have subjected it or, failing any indication thereon, under the law for the time being in force; or

(iii) the party making the application was not given proper notice of the appointment of an arbitrator or of the arbitral proceedings or was otherwise unable to present his case; or

(iv) the arbitral award deals with a dispute not contemplated by or not falling within the terms of the submission to arbitration, or it contains decisions on matters beyond the scope of the submission to arbitration.

(2) The court may set aside the award:

(i)(a) if the composition of the Arbitral Tribunal was not in accordance with the agreement of the parties,

(b) failing such agreement, the composition of the Arbitral Tribunal was not in accordance with Part I of the Act.

(ii) if the arbitral procedure was not in accordance with:

- (a) the agreement of the parties, or
- (b) failing such agreement, the arbitral procedure was not in accordance with Part I of the Act.

However, exception for setting aside the award on the ground of composition of Arbitral Tribunal or illegality of arbitral procedure is that the agreement should not be in conflict with the provisions of Part I of the Act from which parties cannot derogate.

- (c) If the award passed by the Arbitral Tribunal is in contravention of the provisions of the Act or any other substantive law governing the parties or is against the terms of the contract.

(3) The award could be set aside if it is against the public policy of India, that is to say, if it is contrary to:

- (a) fundamental policy of Indian law; or
- (b) the interest of India; or
- (c) justice or morality; or
- (d) if it is patently illegal.
- (4) It could be challenged:
 - (a) as provided under Section 13(5); and
 - (b) Section 16(6) of the Act.

(B)(1) The impugned award requires to be set aside mainly on the grounds:

- (i) there is specific stipulation in the agreement that the time and date of delivery of the goods was of the essence of the contract;
- (ii) in case of failure to deliver the goods within the period fixed for such delivery in the schedule, ONGC was entitled to recover from the contractor liquidated damages as agreed;
- (iii) it was also explicitly understood that the agreed liquidated damages were genuine pre-estimate of damages;
- (iv) on the request of the respondent to extend the time-limit for supply of goods, ONGC informed specifically that time was extended but stipulated liquidated damages as agreed would be recovered;
- (v) liquidated damages for delay in supply of goods were to be recovered by paying authorities from the bills for payment of cost of material supplied by the contractor;
- (vi) there is nothing on record to suggest that stipulation for recovering liquidated damages was by way of penalty or that the said sum was in any way unreasonable.
- (vii) In certain contracts, it is impossible to assess the damages or prove the same. Such situation is taken care of by Sections 73 and 74 of the Contract Act and in the present case by specific terms of the contract."

9. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter titled as **Swan Gold Mining Ltd Versus Hindustan Copper Ltd. Civil Appeal No. 9048 of 2014** has observed in para 12 &13 as under:-

"12. Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act,1996 corresponds to Section 30 of the Arbitration Act,1940 making a provision for setting aside the arbitral award. In terms of sub-section (2) of section 34 of the Act, an arbitral award may be set aside only if one of the conditions specified therein is satisfied. The Arbitrator's decision is generally considered binding between the parties and therefore, the power of the court to set aside the award would be exercised only in cases where the court finds that the arbitral award is on the fact of it erroneous or patently illegal or in contravention of the provisions of the Act. It is a well settled proposition that the court shall not ordinarily substitute its interpretation

for that of the Arbitrator. Similarly, when the parties have arrived at a concluded contract and acted on the basis of those terms and conditions of the contract then substituting new terms in the contract by the Arbitrator or by the court would be erroneous or illegal.

13. It is equally well settled that the Arbitrator appointed by the parties is the final judge of the facts. The finding of facts recorded by him cannot be interfered with on the ground that the terms of the contract were not correctly interpreted by him."

10. It is settled legal proposition that the court is precluded from re-appreciating evidence to arrive at different conclusion by holding that arbitral award was against the public policy.
11. It is held by the Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat in the case of **Oil & Natural Gas Corporation Ltd. Vs. David Parkar Construction Ltd. C/o. I B Patel (P A Holder) & Anr.** CAV Judgment dated 12.06.2024 passed by High Court of Gujarat in First Appeal No.322 of 2010 as under:

"11. Coming to the impugned judgment and order, we find that the learned District Judge has decided the application under Section 34 of the Arbitration Act as an Appellate Court ignoring the provisions of Section 34 of the Arbitration Act. The findings as recorded by the learned District Judge are based on re- appreciation of evidence, which is not permissible. We find that the learned District Judge has re-appreciated all the claims, counter-claims, documents and the evidence on record while allowing the application under Section 34 of the Arbitration Act.

12. It is now well settled that the standard of scrutiny of award can be done only on the grounds envisaged under Section 34 of the Arbitration Act. Judicial review and re-appreciation of evidence are impermissible unless it is made out that the view taken by the Arbitrator is based on patent illegality or on the interpretation of the facts and terms of the contract, which are absolutely perverse. The Court does not sit in appeal over the arbitral award and can only interfere on merits on the limited ground as provided under Section 34(2)(b)(ii), if the award is against the public policy of India, and the award should be in compliance with the Statutes and judicial precedents while adopting a judicial approach and in compliance of the principles of natural justice. Further, it is well settled by the decisions of the Hon'ble Apex Court that patent illegality would constitute contravention of the substantive law of India, contravention of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 and contravention of the terms of the contract. But, the interference by Courts in an arbitral award will not entail review on the merits of the dispute and has to be limited only to situations where it is found that the findings of the Arbitrator are arbitrary, perverse, shocking the conscience of the Court and where the illegality goes to the root of the matter. In the present case, we find that the view taken by the learned Arbitrator was a plausible view and in terms of the contract entered into between the parties. It is well-settled that the awards which contain reasons, when interpreting the contractual terms, are not to be

interfered with lightly. Re-appreciation of evidence is not permissible. The learned Arbitrator has construed the terms of the contract in the correct perspective and hence, it was not open for the learned District Judge to interfere with the award.

13. Further, we find that no manifest illegality has been shown in the award before the learned District Judge nor any finding to that effect has been recorded by the learned District Judge. Further, there are apparent contradictions. In overall view of the matter, we find that the jurisdiction exercised by the learned District Judge under Section 34 of the Arbitration Act is contrary to the provisions contained therein, bad in law and hence, cannot be sustained."

In 2018 (11) SCC 328 (Kinnari Mullick and another Vs. Ghansyam Das Damani), the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has confirmed the proposition laid down in Bhaskar Industrial Development Lits Vs. Southern Railway, wherein it has been held that:

"remitting the matter back to the Arbitrator would constitute an error and that the Parliament has not conferred any power of remand under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996."

In ILR 2010 Karnataka 3711 (Sri. H.M. Shankaramurthy Vs. National Highways Authority of India and others) , wherein it has been held that: A.P. No.73/2020

"... a provision for setting aside an award contending that the award is not sustainable in law on any one of the grounds as indicated above can never be construed as a provision enabling the land owner seeking for enhancement of the compensation amount as determined by the Arbitrator."

In 2017 (4) Karnataka L.J. 27/14 (NHAI Vs. Mahadevi and others), wherein it has been held that:

"We are satisfied that in view of the settled legal position, which is delineated below, the learned Court below has grossly erred in setting aside the arbitral award and has further compounded the said error by substituting its own valuation and compensation amount which was simply not permitted within the scope of Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act 1996".

12. Arbitration is an alternative dispute resolution process which provides that parties to the dispute evolve their own dispute resolution mechanism by consenting to refer their dispute to an independent person on whom both the parties have faith and reposes trust. Autonomy, wisdom and spirit of the parties to resolve their dispute by their own mutually agreed mechanism has been put on highest pedestal by the legislation, which is the reason why legislation has provided for minimum interference of the Court in relation to Arbitration Proceeding. The provisions of Section - 34 of the Act specifically provides that except grounds stated therein the Arbitration Award cannot be challenged. The entire purpose is to give supremacy to the party autonomy.
13. Now looking to the entire case record and the written submissions made by the parties, the citations produced on record by the parties it cannot be said that the award passed by the Ld.

Arbitrator is in any manner contrary to: (a) Fundamental policy of Indian law; or (b) The interest of India; or (c) Justice or morality, or (d) patently illegal. It is well settled by the decisions of the Hon'ble Apex Court that patent illegality would constitute contravention of the substantive law of India, contravention of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 and contravention of the terms of the contract. The interference by Courts in an arbitral award will not entail review on the merits of the dispute and has to be limited only to situations where it is found that the findings of the Arbitrator are arbitrary, perverse, shocking the conscience of the Court and where the illegality goes to the root of the matter. the arbitral award cannot be set aside as per the provisions of and within the ambit of Section 34 of the Arbitration & Conciliation Act. In the present case, no such material has been put forward to satisfy the Court that the award is against the fundamental policy of Indian law or the interest of India or against the natural justice or morality or is patently illegal or nothing substantial to show that the award is arbitrary, perverse or shocking to the conscience of the Court. There is no material to show any patent illegality which goes to the root of the matter. Also the applicant has failed to show which part of the award is specifically a good part and which part is a bad part of the award, other than the submission that the calculation of Compensation is inappropriate and the citations relied on by the applicants are not helpful in present case. The present case being different from the produced citation, the same relied on by the applicant is not helpful in the present case. In view of the above decisions, the reliefs sought by the applicant to set aside the award and to direct the Arbitrator to re-consider the matter cannot be granted. For the above discussion, point No. 1 is answered in the negative. And point no. 2 is decided as per final order below. Therefore, the following final order is passed in the larger interest of justice:

-:-FINAL ORDER:-

- Present Civil Misc. Application's are hereby **dismissed**.
 - No order as to costs.
 - Parties to comply Arbitral award by following due process of law as early as possible.
- File be consigned to record room after due compliance.

Signed and Pronounced in the open Court today on this 28th day of February, 2025.

[**Kruti Sanjay Trivedi**]
Special Judge, Commercial Court &
3rd Addl. District & Sessions Judge,
Ahmedabad (Rural) at Navrangpura.
UIC No.GJ00617