

IN THE COURT OF PRINCIPAL DISTRICT JUDGE AT TIRUVALLUR

PRESENT: Tmt.J. JULIET PUSHPA, B.Sc., M.L.,
Principal District Judge, Tiruvallur

Tuesday, the 15th day of April, 2025

I.A.4/2024 in Arbitration O.P. No.5/2023

National Highways Authority of India
Represented by its Project Director
Chennai

....Petitioner/ petitioner

/Vs/

1. The Arbitrator and District Collector
Tiruvallur
2. The Competent Authority and Special District
Revenue Officer (LA) , Tiruvallur

...Respondents 1 and 2 / Respondents 1 and 2

I.A.4/2024 in Arbitration O.P. No.5/2023

3. R. Madana Gopal, S/o L.B. Ramanjulu

...3rd respondent /claimant

I.A.3/2024 in Arbitration O.P. No.105/2023

3. M. Udayakumar, S/o Munusamy

...3rd respondent /claimant

I.A.3/2024 in Arbitration O.P. No.87/2023

3. P.K. Kothandaram, S/o Parvatham Krishnasamy

...3rd respondent /claimant

I.A.3/2024 in Arbitration O.P. No.109/2023

3. V. Durai Mohan, S/o K. Varadharajalu,

...3rd respondent /claimant

I.A.4/2024 in Arbitration O.P. No.27/2023

3. K. Rajeshwari, W/o P.K. Kothandaraman

...3rd respondent /claimant

I.A.3/2024 in Arbitration O.P. No.71/2023

3. M. Karthick, S/o R. Madhana Gopal,
...3rd respondent /claimant

I.A.2/2024 in Arbitration O.P. No.145/2024

3. J. Siddhartha, S/o R. Jayachandran
...3rd respondent /claimant

I.A.3/2024 in Arbitration O.P. No.44/2023

3. M. Revathi, W/o Mani
...3rd respondent /claimant

I.A.3/2024 in Arbitration O.P. No.106/2023

3. M. Ambika, W/o R. Madana Gopal
...3rd respondent /claimant

I.A.4/2024 in Arbitration O.P. No.11/2023

3. P.K. Kothandaram, S/o Parvatham Krishnasamy
...3rd respondent /claimant

I.A.2/2024 in Arbitration O.P. No.20/2023

3. Gopi (alias) Bhuvaneshwari , W/o Subramanian
...3rd respondent /claimant

I.A.2/2024 in Arbitration O.P. No.120/2024

3. J. Siddhartha, S/o R. Jayachandran,
...3rd respondent /claimant

These petitions coming on 26.03.2025 before me for final hearing in the presence of M/s. SU. Srinivasan, S. Vishaal, R. Manibharathi, learned Counsel for the Petitioner/petitioner and Thiru. E. Vijayakumar, learned Government Pleader appearing for the respondents 1 and 2 and M/s J. Siddhartha, R. Srinivasan, learned counsel for the 3rd respondent in all these petitions, upon hearing arguments on both sides, perusing the materials on records and having stood over for consideration till this date, this Court delivered the following:-

COMMON ORDER

These Petitions are filed by the Petitioner Under 36(2) of Arbitration and Conciliation Act 1996 to stay the operation of the impugned awards passed by the 1st respondent/Arbitrator and District Collector, Tiruvallur in (1) Rc.No.5635-26/2019/F2 Arbitration dated 22.01.2020 , (2) Rc.No.5635-10/2019/F2 Arbitration dated 21.01.2020, (3) Rc.No.5635-43/2019/F2 Arbitration dated 22.01.2020, (4) Rc.No.5635-57/2019/F2 Arbitration dated 22.01.2020, (5) Rc.No.5635-13/2019/F2 Arbitration dated 21.01.2020 (6) Rc.No.5635-59/2019/F2 Arbitration dated 22.01.2020 (7) Rc.No.26265-1/2019/F2 Arbitration dated 31.01.2020 (8) Rc.No. 5635-42/2019/F2 Arbitration dated 22.01.2020, (9) Rc.No.5635-27/2019/F2 Arbitration dated 21.01.2020, (10) Rc.No.5635-11/2019/F2 Arbitration dated 21.01.2020, (11) Rc.No.5635-54/2019/F2 Arbitration dated 22.01.2020, (12) Rc.No.26264-1/2019/F2 Arbitration dated 31.01.2020.

2. The averments in the petitions in common in brief :

According to the petitioner, the 2nd respondent passed award determining the compensation for the 3rd respondent's land and passed an award fixing compensation at Rs.365.44 per sq. mt. which is described as Dry lands in Revenue Records vide Award Proceedings in Rc.No.290/2001A/NH-4/TVR dt. 30.06.2004. As against the said award the 3rd respondent filed Arbitration petition before the 1st respondent belatedly and the 1st respondent enhanced the compensation from Rs.365.44 to Rs.8608/- per sq. meter without any justifiable reasons and by non-speaking award vide dated 21.01.2020. The impugned order was passed without considering any of the contentions raised by the petitioner in the counter including the point of limitation and non-acceptability of previous award. The Arbitrator has passed impugned award without affording any opportunity of hearing. In the impugned award, the enhancement was considered only based on the earlier award vide Rc.No.708-1/2017/F2/ Arbitration dated 04.08.2017 in favour of one Tmt. D. Unnamalai of Vanagaram Village. In the aforesaid award of D. Unnamalai, the then Arbitrator relied on the award dt. 18.12.2015 made in favour of one S. Anbalagan of Koratur Village. the lands covered under these two awards are within 1.6 kilometer. therefore, had applied the said value of acquired lands of the private respondents. The award made in favour of S. Anbalagan, it could be seen his acquired lands are situated in Korattur which is more than 13 kilometer and not within 1.6 kilometer as described by the Arbitrator by relying the value fixed for Korattur had determined

the same village for Vanagaram village. Thereafter, the value of Vanagaram village is adopted to Noombal village also. The value for the acquired land was adopted based on the value of the land conveyed in the exemplar sale deed which is situated beyond 10 kilometer in an approved layout located in a fully developed area, whereas the private respondents' land are classified as wet land in revenue records. The Arbitration petition was filed beyond the period of limitation and no document whatsoever was produced by the private respondents to establish the market value of the acquired land would also fetch Rs.8606/- per sq. meter. The impugned award does not give any reason to discard the market value determined by the 2nd respondent. Therefore, the award is liable to be set aside. The award of the 1st respondent was dated 21.01.2020 and the same was received by the petitioner on 07.09.2020. Therefore, there is no delay in filing the original petition. The 3rd respondents in all the cases have received the entire compensation as determined by the 2nd respondent. The enhancement made vide impugned award is exorbitant, unreasonable and also illegal. The petitioner has reasons to believe that they have fair chances to succeed in the appeal. Therefore, in the interest of justice the impugned award ought to be stayed, otherwise if the enhanced amount is paid to the respondents, it is highly impossible to recover the same from them. The petitioner being statutory body would make payment in the event the final outcome is in favour of 3rd respondents and no prejudice would be caused to them if the stay is granted in the interregnum the funds can be used for the development of infrastructure which is of greater public interest. Hence,

prayed to grant stay the operation of the awards passed by the 1st respondent / Arbitrator / District Collector.

3. The averments in common in the counters filed by the 3rd respondents in brief :

The 3rd respondent filed counter resisting the petition stating that since the petitioner not obtained any interim order or stay from the District Court till date, where the Hon'ble High court, Madras that if no interim order or stay was obtained within 4 weeks of the order, the enhanced compensation to be disbursed to the land owners. Hence, it is unsustainable for the petitioner to oppose in this regard. The petitioner has challenged the award u/s 34 of the Act even though the same was concluded after hearing the submissions made by the both parties and the reasons provided for awarding the claims in favour of the 3rd respondent were proper, adequate and intelligible. The Arbitral Award requires no interference of this Court u/s 34 of the Act. The scope of the legal review of an Arbitral award u/s 34 of the Act by this Court ought to be limited and minimal one and the court cannot indulged in a full-fledged judicial review. The Arbitrator while passing the award has perused the document of (1) Award proceedings of the competent authority (2) Award Rc.No.290/2001/A/NH/TVR dt. 30.06.2004, (3) Arbitration Petition received by the 3rd respondent (4) Enquiry statements recorded on 15.10.2019 (5) counter filed by petitioner and (6) other connected records. The Arbitrator has perused and referred to numerous documents before passing the award and thus, has applied his mind and no requirement of interference. The

Arbitrator has conducted an enquiry on 15.10.2019 and the petitioner was provided with adequate opportunity to present his case. The Arbitrator has rightly considered the rate of the land based on the award of the Collector in the adjacent village, i.e. 1.6 kilometer. The petitioner being a public enterprise cannot approbate and reprobate. Having paid the compensation to the landowners of the adjacent village for a sum of Rs.800/- per sq. ft. it is only proportional if equality is maintained to the landowners of the present village. The petitioner ought to have the same standard with respect to the payment of compensation. Having not raised the period of limitation, the petitioner has acquired to raise the issue at present, thus, the same is merely and afterthought to challenge the award. Nevertheless, the delays in so far as the present proceeding is concerned, is attributable not to the 3rd respondent who has lost his land, ought to be paid a fair compensation and the petitioner cannot oppose the same on technical ground. The petitioner does not even want to pay 50% of the amount of the award to the 3rd respondent despite orders of the Hon'ble High Court, Madras in W.A.No.1970/2023. Since the petitioner has merely raised factual issues, this Court cannot review the case on merits, thus this petition to be dismissed. This Court cannot reconsider the evidence and pleadings that were placed before the Arbitrator until and unless the applicant herein is able to establish that there were errors apparent on the face of the award and such errors would perturb the conscience of the court. Hence, there is no necessity to stay the proceedings and prayed to dismiss this petition.

4. The learned Government Pleader appearing for respondents 1 and 2 endorsed as “no counter”.

5. No oral or documentary evidence adduced on either side.

6. Now, the point for consideration is

1. Whether the petitioner has made out grounds for the staying the Operation of proceedings as prayed for ?

2. Whether the petitions are to be allowed ?

7. POINTS:

Heard both side and records perused.

These petitions are filed by the petitioner, the National Highways Authority of India to stay the operation of the impugned awards passed by the 1st respondent 1st respondent/Arbitrator and District Collector, Tiruvallur in the respective Original petitions.

8. The case of the petitioner is that the impugned awards of the 1st respondent are contrary to the Law and facts on record and also if the amount towards enhanced compensation already deposited into Court is disbursed to the 3rd respondents in the above case, it will prejudice to the case of petitioner and if the Arbitration Original petition is allowed, the recovery of the amount disbursed to the 3rd respondents would be difficult.

9. Per contra, the learned counsel for the 3rd respondent contended that the award passed by the 1st respondent requires no interference and the Hon’ble

High court, Madras has already passed orders in W.A.No.1970/2023 to disburse the 50% of the enhanced compensation amount to the claimants and the stay of the Hon'ble Supreme Court is only on the point of limitation. Further, in respect of some of the other claimants of similar proceedings, enhanced compensation has already been disbursed, hence, there is no ground to stay the proceedings.

10. On perusal of records and points put forth by both side, it is seen that the lands of the 3rd respondents herein were acquired for widening the National Highways and compensation were determined by the competent Authority / 2nd respondent herein vide proceedings dated 30.06.2004, thereby fixing the compensation at Rs.365.45 per sq. mt. Aggrieved over the quantum of compensation and value of the acquired land fixed, the 3rd respondents herein filed Arbitration petitions before the 1st respondent herein, who had passed the impugned orders by enhancing the compensation by fixing the value of the acquired land from enhanced the compensation from Rs.365.44 to Rs.8608/- per sq. meter. As against the orders of the 1st respondent, the petitioner, the National Highways Authority of India has preferred the appeal as Original Petitions before this Court.

11. Pending the Original petition, the land owners approached the Hon'ble High court of Madras and filed Writ Petition Nos. 24542, 24544 to 24546, 24548 to 24552, 24554, 24557, 24558, 24560 to 24563, 24565, 24566, 24568, 24569, 24572 to 24581, 24585 to 24587 and 24589 to 24592/2021,

wherein the Hon'ble High Court, Madras by way of orders dated 17.11.2021 directed the respondents to deposit enhanced compensation amount as per the Arbitral Award together with interest at 9% per annum from the date of taking possession within a period of one week from the date of receipt of copy of the order and if the respondents failed to obtain arbitral award in the Arbitration Original petition before this Court within a period of 4 weeks, the competent authority was directed to disburse the compensation amount to the land owners.

12. As against the orders of the Hon'ble High Court, Madras, the petitioner herein, i.e. National Highways Authority of India preferred Writ Appeal before the Division Bench of Hon'ble High Court, Madras in W.A.No.1970, 2017, 2080, 2082, 2083, 2087, 2097, 2121, 2126, 2162, 2238, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2244, 2246 to 2259, 2263 and 2265 of 2023 and 757, 766, 808, , 816, 817, 826, 835, 1456, 1577, 1579, 1580, 1581, 1621, 1623, 1625, 2196, 2197, 2198 and 2022 of 2022 wherein the Hon'ble Chief Justice, High Court, Madras passed common Judgment on 23.08.2023 , thereby giving directions as follows :

“(i) In some appeals, this Court had directed the present appellant to deposit 50% of the amount of enhanced compensation, which according to the learned counsel for appellant has been complied with and the 50% of the amount is deposited. The 50% of the amount already deposited shall be transferred to the Court of the concerned District Judge, where the application filed by the appellants under section 34 of the Act of 1996 is pending

(ii) *In other appeals, where the amount of 50% of the enhanced compensation amount is not deposited, the same shall be deposited by the present appellant with the concerned Court within a period of ten weeks from today, i.e. 23.08.2023;*

(iii) *The Original petitioners are at liberty to apply for the withdrawal of the amount, which application shall be considered by the concerned District Judge, on its own merits and after hearing all parties concerned, appropriate orders shall be passed*

(iv) *The present appellant may also seek further orders on the stay petition before the learned District Judge.*

(2) *If the respondents failed to obtain any interim order against the arbitral award in the Arbitration Original Petition on the file of the Principal District Court, Tiruvallur within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, the competent authority is directed to disburse the compensation amounts which were deposited by the respondents forthwith ”*

Accordingly, the claimants in the concerned Original petitions have filed Interlocutory applications in their respective cases before this Court seeking permission to withdraw and issue payment order towards 50% of the compensation amount as per the Orders of the Hon’ble High Court, Madras. The petitioner herein has filed these petitions along with the Original petitions to stay the operation of the impugned awards.

13 The learned counsel for the petitioner argued that the entire purpose of the Original petition is to declare the impugned award as null and void and to set aside the same since the Arbitrator and District collector had passed impractical order and entertained a belated Arbitration application which is barred by limitation as the arbitration application ought to have been filed within 3 years, which is the issue to be decided in view of the stay granted by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SLP (Civil) Diary No.36319/2018 vide order dated 19.11.2018. Further the Hon'ble High Court, Madras has dismissed the Writ petition in WP No.31620/2022 vide order dated 28.11.2022 filed by the land owners against the orders of the Arbitrator and District Collector, dismissing their time barred arbitration application, which was also confirmed by the Hon'ble Division Bench in W.A. No.730/2023 vide Order dated 30.03.2023. The learned counsel for the petitioner has also argued that the Arbitrator cum District Collector in this case also passed orders by violating the stay granted in similar proceedings by Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP (Civil) Diary No.36319/2018, thus, committed jurisdictional error and ought not to have entertained the time barred arbitration petition, hence prayed to stay the operation of the impugned awards.

14. Per contra, the learned counsel for the 3rd respondents herein argued that there are instances wherein the competent authority has disbursed the amounts by operation of the awards to some other land owners in the same

locality and in similar awards , and quoted that as per the following proceedings National Highways Authority has already disbursed to many land owners, of the enhanced compensation amount

(i) Rc.No.122/2024/NH-205/Unit-I dated 27.08.2024, (Claimant : R. Indira, W/o V.G. Rajendran for **Rs.2,08,45,288/-**).

(ii) Rc.No.110/2024/NH-205/Unit-III dated 29.08.2024 (Claimant S. Elangovan, S/o Shanmugam for **Rs. 3, 85,080/-**)

(iii) Rc.No.112/2024/NH-205/Uit – I dated /08/2024)(Claimant : R. Sethil Kumar, S/o N. Raghavan, for **Rs. 39,98,701/-**)

(iv) Rc.No.111/2024/NH-205/Unit-III, dated 19.08.2024 (Claimant D. Sekar, S/o Dhamodharan, for **Rs. 9,07,181/-**)

All the above amounts have been already paid to the concerned claimants by way of NEFT into their account. Therefore, the National Highways Authority cannot take different yardsticks by seeking stay the proceedings in respect of only the 3rd respondents herein. He would also argue that the Hon’ble Supreme Court considered the appeal only on the point of limitation and not about quantum of compensation. Therefore, there is no necessity to stay the proceedings as the Hon’ble High Court, Madras has clearly declared the entitlement of the claimants to proceed with the case and to withdraw 50% of their respective compensation. He would further argue that the petitioner’s objection on limitation are legally untenable as the petitioner themselves delayed the filing of Writ appeal which is

now being used as a basis for contesting the landowner's rightful claims. There is no contempt of Court for the said landowners in the impugned awards, thus, they cannot be penalized .

15. Admittedly, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India had in SLP (Civil) Diary No.36319/2018 vide Order dated 19.11.2018 had granted stay of operation against the impugned Judgment of the Hon'ble High Court, Madras Madras in WP(C) (251/2016 in a batch of writ appeals where the Division Bench of Hon'ble High Court, Madras held that the Arbitration petition can be entertained even after 3 years from the date of the award passed by the Special DRO cum Land Acquisition Officer under section 3G(5) of the National Highways Act. The stay until further orders against the impugned order dt. 25.04.2018 was granted by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India vide order dt. 19.11.2018. Hence, in view of the stay granted by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India as stated above, Arbitrators are precluded from taking up any Arbitration petitions filed beyond three years of the Special DRO Award passed by entertaining the arbitration petitions before the 1st respondent based on which the impugned awards were passed.

16. Further on the face of records, it is evident that similar awards which were passed despite the stay granted by the Hon'ble Supreme Court by way of Writ petition, the Hon'ble High Court, Madras initiated suo-moto contempt as well as statutory notice was issued against the then Arbitrators/ District Collector

were initiated in *Suo Moto* Contempt Petition Nos.974/2024, 2542/2023, 132/2024 which are pending. The Hon'ble High Court directed to furnish the details of Arbitral Awards passed subsequent to the stay order granted by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India on 19.11.2018. It also appears on the face of records that the Hon'ble High Court Madras issued statute notice for personal appearance of the Arbitrator cum District Collectors including the then District Collector of Tiruvallur in *Suo Moto* Contempt Petition No.974/2024.

17. Further, on perusal of the orders of Hon'ble High court, Madras in W.A. No.1970/2023 dated 23.08.2023 that the 3rd respondents herein were granted liberty to file application for withdrawal of amount and also entitled the petitioner to file the stay petition for consideration by this Court.

18. The Hon'ble High Court, Madras in the orders in W.P.Nos.28755,28758, 28759 & 28761 of 2023 and W.MP. .Nos.28331, 28335, 28337 and 28341 of 2023 dated 09.10.2023 held that the third respondent (claimant) in all the writ petitions filed Arbitration Petition u/s 3G(5) of NH Act on 20.07.2018 after a period of more than 11 years seeking enhancement of compensation, which is beyond the period of limitation of three years as per Article 137 of Limitation Act. On receipt of the Arbitration petitions, the petitioner (National Highways Authority of India) raised the preliminary objection and filed a counter affidavit stating that though the Division Bench of the Hon'ble High Court, Madras allowed the writ petition in favour of land

owners, the said order has been stayed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court until further orders in SLP (Civil) Diary No.36319/2018 vide Order dated 19.11.2018 and the said stay is still in force, but the 1st respondent (District Collector / Arbitrator) without any enquiry and without providing any opportunity passed the impugned order. The Hon'ble High Court further held that

“It is the violation of Hon'ble Supreme Court Order, despite the writ petitioner brought all the facts and filed their counter and knowing fully well, the first respondent passed the order, therefore, this Court is inclined to take suo motu contempt against the 1st respondent”

19. On perusal of records, the compensation award was passed by the 2nd respondent in the year 2004. The Original Arbitration petitions were filed before the District Collector, Tiruvallur in the year 2018, which is after 14 years of the award of the competent authority. The petitioner has also produced the information obtained under RTI Act from the Public Information Officer, District Collector, Tiruvallur stating that one of the claimant has not filed his Arbitration application allegedly sent by him dated 29.06.2006, 10.12.2009, 30.07.2012 , 17.07.2014 and 23.02.2017, but filed the petition only on 23.12.2018, which was issued under RTI Act to the petitioner. Thus, it appears that in respect of the above said impugned award, the Arbitration petitions were filed only in the year 2018.

20. The learned counsel for the petitioner has also submitted that in respect of disbursal of amount to the claimant namely R. Indira was not disbursed not in concurrence of the petitioner by the competent authority and in this regard the petitioner sent a letter on 13.02.2023 to the 2nd respondent clarifying the pendency of W.A. 2382/2022 dt. 01.11.2022, and requested the 2nd respondent to preserve the same till the outcome of the final orders of the Hon'ble High Court, Madras in the Writ appeal and subsequently on 21.11.2024 sent a communication in NHAI/18011/97.& (Arb-Pandur)/ 2023 / PIU Chennai-2 1647 requesting the office of Competent Authority that recovery notice and recovery proceedings to be initiated for providing the copy of the same before this Court.

21. In the above said circumstances, the stay order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has relevance to the proceedings of the case, which has to be considered as preliminary issue in deciding the main Original Petition. Since the Arbitration Original petitions are still under consideration for enquiry and also payment out petition are still under consideration before this Court and also as there is prima facie ground prevails in view of the Orders of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SLP (Civil) Diary No.36319/2018 vide Order dated 19.11.2018 and also *Suo Moto* Contempt Petition Nos.974/2024, 2542/2023, 132/2024 initiated by the Hon'ble High Court, Madras as against similar proceedings of the impugned awards by the Arbitrator of Tiruvallur District and other Districts which are still kept pending. Since one of the primary ground on which the impugned award is questioned by the petitioner is on the ground of limitation and

the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also seized of that particular issue, there is ground for order of stay of all further proceedings on the operation of the impugned awards in the Arbitration Original Petitions. These points are answered accordingly.

I.A. 4/2024 in Arbitration O.P.5/2023

In the result, this petition is allowed and and there shall be an order of stay on operation of impugned award of the 1st respondent in Rc.No.5635-26/2019/F2/Arbitration dated 22.01.2020 till the disposal of the Arbitration Original petition.

I.A.3/2024 in Arbitration O.P. No.105/2023

In the result, this petition is allowed and and there shall be an order of stay on operation of impugned award of the 1st respondent in Rc.No.5635-10/2019/F2/Arbitration dated 21.01.2020 till the disposal of the Arbitration Original petition.

I.A.3/2024 in Arbitration O.P. No.87/2023

In the result, this petition is allowed and and there shall be an order of stay on operation of impugned award of the 1st respondent in Rc.No.5635-43/2019/F2/Arbitration dated 22.01.2020 till the disposal of the Arbitration Original petition.

I.A.3/2024 in Arbitration O.P. No.109/2023

In the result, this petition is allowed and and there shall be an order of stay on operation of impugned award of the 1st respondent in Rc.No.5635-57/2019/F2/Arbitration dated 22.01.2020 till the disposal of the Arbitration Original petition.

I.A.4/2024 in Arbitration O.P. No.27/2023

In the result, this petition is allowed and and there shall be an order of stay on operation of impugned award of the 1st respondent in Rc.No.5635-13/2019/F2/Arbitration dated 21.01.2020 till the disposal of the Arbitration Original petition.

I.A.3/2024 in Arbitration O.P. No.71/2023

In the result, this petition is allowed and and there shall be an order of stay on operation of impugned award of the 1st respondent in Rc.No.5635-59/2019/F2/Arbitration dated 22.01.2020 till the disposal of the Arbitration Original petition.

I.A.2/2024 in Arbitration O.P. No.145/2024

In the result, this petition is allowed and and there shall be an order of stay on operation of impugned award of the 1st respondent in Rc.No.26265-1/2019/F2 Arbitration dated 31.01.2020 till the disposal of the Arbitration Original petition.

I.A.3/2024 in Arbitration O.P. No.44/2023

In the result, this petition is allowed and and there shall be an order of stay on operation of impugned award of the 1st respondent in Rc.No. 5635-42/2019/F2/Arbitration dated 22.01.2020 till the disposal of the Arbitration Original petition.

I.A.3/2024 in Arbitration O.P. No.106/2023

In the result, this petition is allowed and and there shall be an order of stay on operation of impugned award of the 1st respondent in Rc.No.5635-27/2019/F2/Arbitration dated 21.01.2020 till the disposal of the Arbitration Original petition.

I.A.4/2024 in Arbitration O.P. No.11/2023

In the result, this petition is allowed and and there shall be an order of stay on operation of impugned award of the 1st respondent in Rc.No.5635-11/2019/F2/Arbitration dated 21.01.2020 till the disposal of the Arbitration Original petition.

I.A.2/2024 in Arbitration O.P. No.20/2023

In the result, this petition is allowed and and there shall be an order of stay on operation of impugned award of the 1st respondent in Rc.No.5635-54/2019/F2/Arbitration dated 22.01.2020 till the disposal of the Arbitration Original petition.

I.A.2/2024 in Arbitration O.P. No.120/2024

In the result, this petition is allowed and there shall be an order of stay on operation of impugned award of the 1st respondent in Rc.No.26264-1/2019/F2/Arbitration dated 31.01.2020 till the disposal of the Arbitration Original petition.

Dictated to Steno-typist, taken down, transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in Open Court, this the 15th day of April, 2025

**PRINCIPAL DISTRICT JUDGE,
TIRUVALLUR**

Petitioner side Witness/Exhibits : - Nil -

Respondent side Witness/Exhibits : - Nil -

**PRINCIPAL DISTRICT JUDGE,
TIRUVALLUR**