

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
AT JABALPUR

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VIVEK RUSIA,
ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE

&

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE PRADEEP MITTAL
ON THE 15th OF JULY, 2026

WRIT PETITION No. 27926 of 2025

M/S CENTRAL INDIA ENGINEERING PVT LTD AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

.....
Appearance:

Shri Sanjay K. Agrawal learned Senior Advocate with Shri Jaideep Sirpurkar, Advocate for the petitioners.

Shri Bharat Singh, learned Senior Advocate through Video Conferencing with Shri Akash Choudhary, Advocate for the respondents.

Shri Siddhartha Sharma, learned counsel for the respondents No.2 & 3.

.....
WITH

WRIT PETITION No. 4563 of 2024

*M/S CENTRAL INDIA ENGINEERING PVT. LTD(ERSTWHILE
CENTRAL INDIA ENGINEERING) AND OTHERS*

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

.....
Appearance:

Shri Sanjay K. Agrawal learned Senior Advocate with Shri Jaideep Sirpurkar, Advocate for the petitioners.

Shri Bharat Singh, learned Senior Advocate through Video Conferencing with Shri Akash Choudhary, Advocate for the respondents.

Shri Siddhartha Sharma, learned counsel for the respondents No.2 & 3.

.....
WRIT PETITION No. 16078 of 2024

*M/S. CENTRAL INDIA ENGINEERING PVT. LTD. (ERSTWHILE
CENTRAL INDIA ENGINEERING) A COMPANY INCORPORAT AND
OTHERS*

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Appearance:

Shri Sanjay K. Agrawal learned Senior Advocate with Shri Jaideep Sirpurkar, Advocate for the petitioners.

Shri Bharat Singh, learned Senior Advocate through Video Conferencing with Shri Akash Choudhary, Advocate for the respondents.

Shri Siddhartha Sharma, learned counsel for the respondents No.2 & 3.

WRIT PETITION No. 23563 of 2024

M/S. CENTRAL INDIA ENGINEERING PVT. LTD. AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Appearance:

Shri Sanjay K. Agrawal learned Senior Advocate with Shri Jaideep Sirpurkar, Advocate for the petitioners.

Shri Bharat Singh, learned Senior Advocate through Video Conferencing with Shri Akash Choudhary, Advocate for the respondents.

Shri Siddhartha Sharma, learned counsel for the respondents No.2 & 3.

WRIT PETITION No. 24250 of 2024

***M/S CENTRAL INDIA ENGINEERING PVT LTD (ERSTWHILE
CENTRAL INDIA ENGINEERING) AND OTHERS***

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Appearance:

Shri Sanjay K. Agrawal learned Senior Advocate with Shri Jaideep Sirpurkar, Advocate for the petitioners.

Shri Bharat Singh, learned Senior Advocate through Video Conferencing with Shri Akash Choudhary, Advocate for the respondents.

Shri Siddhartha Sharma, learned counsel for the respondents No.2 & 3.

WRIT PETITION No. 4400 of 2026

M/S CENTRAL INDIA ENGINEERING PVT LTD AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Appearance:

Shri Sanjay K. Agrawal learned Senior Advocate with Shri Jaideep Sirpurkar, Advocate for the petitioners.

Shri Bharat Singh, learned Senior Advocate through Video Conferencing with Shri Akash Choudhary, Advocate for the respondents.

Shri Siddhartha Sharma, learned counsel for the respondents No.2 & 3.

WRIT PETITION No. 4768 of 2026

M/S CENTRAL INDIA ENGINEERING PVT. LTD AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Appearance:

Shri Sanjay K. Agrawal learned Senior Advocate with Shri Jaideep Sirpurkar, Advocate for the petitioners.

Shri Bharat Singh, learned Senior Advocate through Video Conferencing with Shri Akash Choudhary, Advocate for the respondents.

Shri Siddhartha Sharma, learned counsel for the respondents No.2 & 3.

WRIT PETITION No. 5332 of 2026

M/S CENTRAL INDIA ENGINEERING PVT. LTD. AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Appearance:

Shri Sanjay K. Agrawal learned Senior Advocate with Shri Jaideep Sirpurkar, Advocate for the petitioners.

Shri Bharat Singh, learned Senior Advocate through Video Conferencing with Shri Akash Choudhary, Advocate for the respondents.

Shri Siddhartha Sharma, learned counsel for the respondents No.2 & 3.

WRIT PETITION No. 5883 of 2026

M/S CENTRAL INDIA ENGINEERING PVT. LTD. AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Appearance:

Shri Sanjay K. Agrawal learned Senior Advocate with Shri Jaideep Sirpurkar, Advocate for the petitioners.

Shri Bharat Singh, learned Senior Advocate through Video

Conferencing with Shri Akash Choudhary, Advocate for the respondents.

Shri Siddhartha Sharma, learned counsel for the respondents No.2 & 3.

.....

WRIT PETITION No. 6269 of 2026

MS CENTRAL INDIA ENGINEERING PVT LTD AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

.....

Appearance:

Shri Sanjay K. Agrawal learned Senior Advocate with Shri Jaideep Sirpurkar, Advocate for the petitioners.

Shri Bharat Singh, learned Senior Advocate through Video Conferencing with Shri Akash Choudhary, Advocate for the respondents.

Shri Siddhartha Sharma, learned counsel for the respondents No.2 & 3.

.....

WRIT PETITION No. 6284 of 2026

MS CENTRAL INDIA ENGINEERING PVT LTD AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

.....

Appearance:

Shri Sanjay K. Agrawal learned Senior Advocate with Shri Jaideep Sirpurkar, Advocate for the petitioners.

Shri Bharat Singh, learned Senior Advocate through Video Conferencing with Shri Akash Choudhary, Advocate for the respondents.

Shri Siddhartha Sharma, learned counsel for the respondents No.2 & 3.

.....

WRIT PETITION No. 6385 of 2026

M/S CENTRAL INDIA ENGINEERING PVT. LTD. AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

.....

Appearance:

Shri Sanjay K. Agrawal learned Senior Advocate with Shri Jaideep Sirpurkar, Advocate for the petitioners.

Shri Bharat Singh, learned Senior Advocate through Video Conferencing with Shri Akash Choudhary, Advocate for the respondents.

Shri Siddhartha Sharma, learned counsel for the respondents No.2 &

3.

WRIT PETITION No. 6388 of 2026

M/S CENTRAL INDIA ENGINEERING PVT. LTD. AND OTHERS
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Appearance:

Shri Sanjay K. Agrawal learned Senior Advocate with Shri Jaideep Sirpurkar, Advocate for the petitioners.

Shri Bharat Singh, learned Senior Advocate through Video Conferencing with Shri Akash Choudhary, Advocate for the respondents.

Shri Siddhartha Sharma, learned counsel for the respondents No.2 & 3.

WRIT PETITION No. 10715 of 2026

JOINT VENTURE OF MULTIURBAN INFRA SERVICES PVT LTD
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Appearance:

Shri Sanjay K. Agrawal learned Senior Advocate with Shri Jaideep Sirpurkar, Advocate for the petitioners.

Shri Bharat Singh, learned Senior Advocate through Video Conferencing with Shri Akash Choudhary, Advocate for the respondents.

Shri Siddhartha Sharma, learned counsel for the respondents No.2 & 3.

Reserved on : 02.07.2026

Pronounced on: 15.07.2026

ORDER

Per. Vivek Rusia, Acting Chief Justice

In this bunch of writ petitions since common question of law and fact are involved, therefore, they were heard analogously and they are being decided by this common order. However, for the sake of clarity and

convenience, facts of Writ Petition No.27926/2025 are enumerated hereunder.

Facts of the case, in short, are as under:

2. The petitioner No.1 (M/s Central India Engineering Pvt. Ltd.) is a company registered under the Companies Act with effect from 01/7/2021 after abolition/merger of the proprietary firm, namely, M/s Central India Engineering. The petitioner No.1 has been engaged in the business of civil infrastructure construction under the name and style "M/s Central India Engineering Pvt. Ltd." The petitioner No.1/Firm is a joint venture of "M/s Central India Engineering" and "Multiurban Infra Services Pvt. Ltd." {hereinafter referred to as the "Joint Venture"}. This joint venture has entered into bidding of the project in question for execution of the work in question. The petitioner No.1 has been categorized as a service provider enterprises and it is a small scale industrial unit, therefore, it is governed under the provisions of Micro, Small & Medium Enterprises Act, 2006.

3. The respondent No.2 is the Madhya Pradesh Urban Development Company Limited (hereinafter referred to as the "MPUDCL") which is an undertaking of Government of Madhya Pradesh and it has been entrusted with a responsibility of providing technical support; financial assistance for different projects in urban sector; and raising of funds from Government of M.P. and other financial institutions. The respondent No.1/State Government floated a tender for the work of MPUSIP 1C Improvement of Water Supply in Bankhedi and Sohagpur Nagar Parishads in District Hoshangabad of

Madhya Pradesh. The said work is funded by the Asian Development Bank (ADB). The petitioner entered into an agreement with the respondents on 23.2.2017 in respect of aforesaid tender work.

4. According to the petitioner, the respondent No.2 issued an Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) vide communication dated 01/10/2021 thereby unilaterally amending agreed clause 11.7 of the FIDIC Gold Book and the special conditions of contract for issuance of commissioning certificate. The said SOP is causing adverse financial burden upon the petitioner No.1 during the extended period of two years in respect of operation and maintenance. The original clause 11.7 of the FIDIC Gold Book has been deleted at the cost and expenses of the petitioner No.1. As per the original clause, commissioning certificate used to constitute acceptance of the work and now the same has been changed by issuance of SOP dated 01.10.2021 which is relating to the substantial sectional commissioning certificate and also altered payment terms for operation and maintenance of bills, and thereby restricting release of payment of 80% of the invoiced amount for the years of O&M period. Now, instead of commissioning certificate, the respondent No.2 has issued a substantial sectional commissioning certificate, which has given cause of action to petitioner for filing of the present writ petition.

5. After issuance of notice, the respondents No.2 & 3 have filed reply by submitting that as per contract agreement dated 10.4.2017 the petitioner was obligated to complete the work of building and design under

the contract in 850 days but the petitioner completed and commissioned on 14.12.2024 instead on 25.8.2019 in Bankhedi and Sohagpur. The respondent has raised the issue of delay in filing the petition because the petitioner is challenging the letters issued by the respondent on 01.10.2021 and 31.3.2023 which have been filed as Annexure-P/6 & P/8 respectively. It is submitted that before issuing two impugned letters the respondents had already issued revised variation methodology for awarding contracts on 08.5.2019, which the petitioner has not challenged. This impugned letters have been issued only as per methodology for variation approvals. Since the petitioner had completed and commissioned work in the year 2024, therefore, the operation and management of the project is liable to be extended artificially upto 2034. The respondents have also raised an objection that there is alternative and efficacious remedy as per Clauses 20.7 & 20.8 of the FIDIC Gold Book before the Dispute Adjudicatory Board (DAB). Being dissatisfied with this decision the petitioner can proceed for amicable settlement and thereafter for arbitration before the Madhyastham Tribunal, Bhopal.

6. Clauses 20.3 to 20.11 of the FIDIC Gold Book, being relevant for adjudication of the *lis* involved, the same are quoted hereunder:-

" 2 0 . 3 Appointment of the Dispute Adjudication Board- Disputes arising during the Design-Build Period shall be adjudicated by a DAB in accordance with Sub-Clause 20.6 [Obtaining Dispute Adjudication Board's Decision]. The Parties shall jointly appoint a DAB by the date stated in the Contract Data.

The DAB shall comprise, as stated in the Contract Data, either one or three suitably qualified persons ("the members"). If the number is not so stated and the Parties do not agree otherwise, the DAB shall comprise three persons.

If the DAB is to comprise three persons, each Party shall nominate one member for the approval of the other Party. The Parties shall consult both these members and shall agree upon the third member, who shall be appointed to act as chairman.

However, if a list of potential members is included in the contract, the members shall be selected from those on the list, subject to their being able and willing to accept appointment to the DAB.

The agreement between the Parties and either the sole member ("adjudicator") or each of the three members shall incorporate by reference the General Conditions of Dispute Adjudication Agreement in these General Conditions, with such amendments as are agreed between them.

The terms of the remuneration of either the sole member or each of the three members shall be mutually agreed upon by the Parties when Agreeing the terms of appointment. Each Party shall be responsible for paying one half of this remuneration.

If at any time the Parties so agree, they may appoint a suitably qualified person or persons to replace any one or more members of the DAB. Unless the Parties agree otherwise, the appointment will come into effect, if a member declines to act or is unable to act as a result of death, disability, resignation or termination of appointment. The replacement shall be appointed in the

same manner as the replaced person was required to have been nominated or agreed upon, as described in this Sub-Clause. However the appointment of any member may only be terminated by mutual agreement of both Parties, and not by the Employer or the Contractor acting alone.

Unless otherwise agreed by both Parties, the appointment of the DAB (including each member) shall expire upon the issue of the Commissioning Certificate under Sub-Clause 9.12 (Completion of Design-Build) or 28 days after the DAB has given its decision to a Dispute under Sub Clause 20.6 (Obtaining Dispute Adjudication Board's Decision), whichever is the later.

Z0.4 Failure to Agree Dispute Adjudication Board- *If any of the following conditions apply, namely:*

(a) the Parties fail to agree upon the appointment of the sole member of the DAB by the date stated in the first paragraph of Sub-Clause 20.3 [Appointment of the Dispute Adjudication Board];

(b) either Party fails to nominate a member (for approval by the other Party), or fails to approve a member nominated by the other Party, of a DAB of three persons by such date; /

(c) the Parties fail, to agree upon the appointment of the third member (to act as chairman) of the DAB by such date, or

(d) — the Parties fail to agree upon the appointment of a replacement person within 42 days after the date on which the sole member or one of the three members declines to act or is unable to act as a result of death,

disability, resignation or termination of appointment,

then the Appointing entity or official named in the Contract Data shall, upon the request of either or both of the Parties and after due consultation with both Parties, appoint this member of the DAB. This appointment shall be final and conclusive. Each Party shall be responsible for paying one-half of the remuneration of the appointing “entity or official.

20.5 Avoidance of Disputes - *If at any time the Parties so agree, they may jointly refer a matter to the DAB in writing with a request to provide assistance and/or informally discuss and attempt to resolve any disagreement that may have arisen between the Parties during the performance of the Contract. Such informal assistance may take place during any meeting, Site visit or otherwise. However, unless the Parties agree otherwise, both Parties must be present at such discussions. The Parties are not bound to act upon any advice given during such informal meetings, and the DAB shall not be bound in any future Dispute Resolution process and decision by any views given during the informal assistance process, whether provided orally or in writing.*

If a Dispute of any kind whatsoever arises between the Parties, whether or not any informal discussions have been held under this Sub-Clause, either Party may refer the Dispute in writing to the DAB according to the provisions of Sub-Clause 20.6 [Obtaining Dispute Adjudication Board's Decision].

20.6 Obtaining Dispute Adjudication Board's Decision- *If a Dispute (of any kind whatsoever) arises between the Parties in connection with, or arising out of, the*

Contract or the execution of the works, during the Design-Build Period, including any Dispute as to any certificate, determination, instruction, opinion or valuation of the Employer's Representative, either Party may, within 28 days of issuing a notice of dissatisfaction under Sub-Clause 20.1 (d) [Contractor's Claims] or Sub-Clause 20.2 [Employer's Claims], refer the Dispute in writing to the DAB for its decision, with copies to the other Party and the Employer's Representative. Such reference shall state that it is given under this Sub- Clause. The other Party shall then have 21 days to send a response to the DAB with, copies to the referring Party and the Employer's Representative. If the dissatisfied Party, has not formally referred the matter to the DAB within the said 28-day period, the notice of dissatisfaction shall be deemed to have lapsed and no longer be considered to be valid.

For a DAB of three persons, the DAB shall be deemed to have received such submissions on the date when they are received by the chairman of the DAB.

Both Parties shall promptly make available to the DAB all information, access to the Site, and appropriate facilities as the DAB may require for the purposes of making a decision on such Dispute. The DAB shall not act as arbitrator(s).

Within 84 days after receiving other Party's response or, if no such response is received, within 105 days after receiving the reference, or within such other period as may be proposed by the DAB and approved by both Parties, the DAB shall give its decision in writing to both Parties and the Employer's Representative, which shall be reasoned and shall State that it is given under this Sub-

Clause. The decision shall be binding on both Parties and the Employer's Representative, who shall promptly comply with it notwithstanding that a Party gives a notice of dissatisfaction with such decision as described below. Unless the Contract has already been abandoned, repudiated or terminated, the Contractor shall continue to proceed with the Works in accordance, with the Contract.

If either Party is dissatisfied with the DAB's decision, then either Party may, within 28 days after receiving the decision, give Notice to the other Party of its dissatisfaction. If the DAB fails to give its decision within the period prescribed in this Sub-Clause, then either Party may, within 28 days after this period has expired, give Notice to the other Party of its dissatisfaction. In either case, the dissatisfied Party shall send a copy of the Notice to the chairman of the DAB.

In either event, this notice of dissatisfaction shall state that it is given under this Sub Clause, and shall set out the matter in Dispute and the reason(s) for dissatisfaction. Except as stated in Sub-Clause 20.9 [Failure to Comply with Dispute Adjudication Board's Decision], neither Party shall be entitled to commence arbitration of a Dispute unless a notice of dissatisfaction with respect to that Dispute has been given in accordance with this Sub-Clause.

If the decision of the DAB requires a payment by one Party to the other Party, the DAB may require the payee to provide an appropriate security in respect of such payment.

If the DAB has given its decision as to a matter in Dispute to both Parties, and no

Notice of dissatisfaction has been given by either Party within 28 days after it received the DAB's decision, then the decision shall become final and binding upon both Parties.

***20.7 Amicable Settlement** - Where Notice of dissatisfaction has been given under Sub, clause 20.6 [Obtaining Dispute Adjudication Board's Decision], both Parties shall attempt to settle the Dispute amicably before the commencement of arbitrations. However, unless both Parties agree otherwise, arbitration may be commenced On or after the twenty-eighth day after the day on which notice of dissatisfaction was given, even if no attempt at amicable settlement has been made. "*

***20.8 Arbitration** - Unless settled amicably, and subject to Sub clause 20.9 [Failure to Comply with Dispute Adjudication Board's Decision], any dispute in respect of which the DAB's decision (if any) has not become final and binding shall be finally settled by international arbitration. Unless otherwise agreed by both Parties:*

(a) the Dispute shall be finally settled under the Rules of Arbitration of the International Chamber of Commerce;

(b) the Dispute shall be settled by three arbitrators appointed in accordance with these Rules; and

(c) the arbitration shall be conducted in the language for communications defined in Sub- Clause 1.4 (Law and Language) unless otherwise stated in the Contract Data.

The arbitrator(s) shall have full power, to open up, review and revise any certificate,

determination, instruction, opinion or valuation of the Employer's Representative, and any decision of the DAB, relevant to the Dispute. Nothing shall disqualify the Employer's Representative from being called as a witness and giving evidence before the arbitrator(s) on any matter whatsoever relevant to the Dispute.

Neither party shall be limited in the proceeding before the arbitrator (s) to the evidence or arguments previously put before the DAB to obtain its decision, or to the reason for dissatisfaction given in its Notice of Dissatisfaction. Any decision of the DAB shall be admissible in evidence in the arbitration.

Arbitration may be commenced prior to or after completion of the Works. The obligation of the Parties, the employer Representatives and the DAB shall not be altered by reason of any arbitration being conducted during the progress of the Works.

20.9 Failure to Comply with Dispute Adjudication Board's Decision: *In the event that a Party fails to comply with any decision of the DAB, whether binding or final and binding, then the other Party may, without prejudice to any other rights it may have, refer the failure itself to arbitration under Sub-Clause 20.8 [Arbitration] for summary or other expedited relief, as may be appropriate. Sub-Clause 20.6 [Obtaining Dispute Adjudication Board's Decision] and Sub-Clause 20.7 (Amicable Settlement) shall not apply to this reference.*

20.10 Disputes Arising during the Operation Service Period: *Disputes arising during the Operation Service Period which cannot be resolved between the Parties shall be settled by a one-person DAB ("Operation*

Service DAB"). Such person shall be jointly agreed and appointed by the Parties at the time of issue of the Commissioning Certificate.

If the Parties cannot agree on the person who shall be the Operation Service DAB, then the person shall be appointed according to the provisions of Sub-Clause 20.4 Failure to Agree Dispute Adjudication Board).

Such person shall be appointed for a term of five years. At the end of each five-year period, a new Operation Service DAB shall be agreed and appointed. If both Parties and the previously appointed person agree, the same Operation Service DAB may be re-appointed for a second (or third or fourth, as the case may be) five years term.

The agreement between the Parties and the Operation Service DAB shall incorporate by reference the General Conditions of Dispute Adjudication Agreement contained in these General Conditions, with such amendments as are agreed between them.

The terms of remuneration of the Operation Service DAB shall be mutually agreed upon by the Parties when agreeing the terms of appointment. Each Party shall be responsible for paying one-half of this remuneration

The procedure for obtaining a decision from the Operation Service DAB shall be in accordance with the provisions of Sub-Clause 20.6 [Obtaining Dispute Adjudication Board's Decision] and the DAB shall give its decision no later than 84 days after receiving the other Party's response or, if no such response is received, within 105 days after receiving the reference and the supporting documentation from the Party referring the

Dispute..

The appointment of the Operation Service DAB shall expire five years after the date of its appointment unless such appointment is extended for a further five years as aforementioned.

If either Party is dissatisfied with the decision of the Operation Service DAB, the provisions of Sub-Clauses 20.6 (Obtaining Dispute Adjudication Board's Decision). 20.7 [Amicable Settlement), 20.8 (Arbitration) and 20.9 [Failure to Comply with Dispute Adjudication Board's Decision] shall apply.

20.11 Expiry of Dispute Adjudication Board's Appointment : *If a Dispute arises between the Parties in connection with, or arising out of, the Contract or the execution of the Works and there is no DAB in place, whether by reason of the expiry of the DAB's appointment or otherwise:*

(a) Sub-Clause 20.6 [Obtaining Dispute Adjudication Board's Decision] and Sub-Clause 20.7 [Amicable Settlement], or Sub-Clause 20.10 [Disputes Arising during the Operation Service Period], as the case may be, shall not apply; and

(b) The Dispute may be referred directly to arbitration under Sub-Clause 20.8 [Arbitration]"

7. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record. In all fairness, the petitioner should have disclosed this arbitration clause in paragraph 3 of the writ petition. The petitioner has an alternative and efficacious remedy of a dispute adjudicatory process and thereafter arbitration. Whether the issue of revised variation methodology or SOP

amounts to change of terms and conditions of contract, the same is liable to be decided by an Arbitrator. As per communication dated 09.5.2024 (Annexure-R/2) written by the Engineer-in-Chief, MPUDC, the petitioner had already been given a chance to raise an issue in DAB, and the DAB decision dated 24.7.2023 in case No.39/22-23, was already intimated. Being dissatisfied with DAB decision the petitioner could have served the notice to others party, in order to invoke clause 20.8 of FIDIC Gold Book. The petitioner has suppressed all these communications before this Court in this writ petition.

8. Therefore, we do not find any ground to interfere in these writ petitions. The petitioners, if so advised, may avail the alternative remedy which is available to them.

9. Accordingly, these writ petitions stand dismissed with the cost of Rs.1,00,000.00 (Rupees One Lac only) in total in all the writ petitions, to be deposited in the **Chief Minister Relief Fund of Madhya Pradesh.**

(VIVEK RUSIA)
ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE
RM

(PRADEEP MITTAL)
JUDGE