International Journal of Innovations & Research Analysis (IJIRA)
(An International Quarterly Multidisciplinary Peer Reviewed Refereed Journal)
ISSN: 2583-0295 (Online), Impact Factor: (Cosmos 7.662 & I2OR 5.105), Volume 06, No. 03(I), July-September, 2026, pp 185-193

Challenges to Arbitral Awards Under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act: Issues, Interpretations, and Judicial Trends

Mr. Shivam Jasra*

PhD Research Scholar, Department of Law, SRM University, Delhi-NCR, Sonipat.

*Corresponding Author: shivamjasra1@gmail.com

Citation: Jasra, S. (2026). Challenges to Arbitral Awards Under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act: Issues, Interpretations, and Judicial Trends. International Journal of Innovations & Research Analysis, 06(03(I)), 185–193. https://doi.org/10.62823/IJIRA/06.3(I).9399

Abstract

"quite obviously if one were to include the power to modify an award in Section 34, one would be crossing the Lakshman Rekha and doing what, according to the justice of a case, ought to be done. In interpreting a statutory provision, a Judge must put himself in the shoes of Parliament and then ask whether Parliament intended this result."

~ Justice Rohinton Fali Nariman and Justice BR Gavai

The only principal statutory mechanism available to a party against whom an Award is passed in an Arbitration Proceedings is to challenge the said award under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996. The provision which was perceived to be a rare and extraordinary relief, now stands out as the most litigious issue which causes substantial delays in the arbitral process as against the mandate of the arbitration law itself. This research paper scrutinizes the Legislations and the intent behind it and the Hon'ble Apex Court's and interpretations of Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 with a clear reference to the grounds enunciated in the provision itself such as public policy, patent illegality, lack of jurisdiction, procedural unfairness, and violation of natural justice. This paper also narrates how the judiciary while expanding and then restricting the standards of "public policy" and "patent illegality" has swayed the award-challenge terrain. By analysing copiously the cited precedents and major amendments in legislation in the year 2015, 2019, and 2021 which shaped Section 34 and the subsequent judicial effort to confine the intervention strictly to the grounds, this research paper attempts to determine if the ongoing system and practices has fully achieved its objective.

***Keywords**: Arbitration, Awards, Challenges, Section 34, Public Policy, Patent Illegality.*

Introduction

The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 ("The Arbitration Act") was enacted on the premise of providing an efficient alternative to the conventional dispute resolution mechanism i.e., litigation in courts. The said Act was majorly based on UNCITAL Model Law. The Arbitration Act was framed in a manner to promote the principle of party autonomy, procedural efficiency and finality of Arbitral decisions along with stricter and well defined timelines. The primary intent aimed at simplifying the commercial dispute resolution and decreasing the stress on the courts. However, the effectiveness of the process of arbitration as a dispute resolution mechanism depends not only upon the arbitral process itself but also upon the confidence of the parties in the finality and enforceability of the Arbitral award. Likewise, a mechanism for judicial review is necessary to ensure that arbitral tribunals remain within their jurisdiction and that awards affected by laden legal and procedural defects are duly reviewed. Thus, arbitration cannot be viewed as a completely self-contained mechanism operating in isolation from the courts. It can be said that its legitimacy and effectiveness are closely intertwined with the manner and extent of judicial intervention once the proceedings attains finality post-award.

The evolution of Section 34 jurisprudence therefore reflects the continuing effort of courts to reconcile two objectives behind the Act: preserving the autonomy and finality of arbitration while ensuring judicial correction of awards that suffer from defects as defined under Section 34 of the Arbitration Act. The application of the 1996 Act Section 34, which sets aside arbitral awards exclusively, is key to the relationship between arbitration and judicial review in India.

Notwithstanding the major amendments in the laws made in 2015, 2019, and the judicial decisions that restricted the range of interference, the filing of petitions under Section 34 still remains to be one of the most contested areas in the Indian Arbitration landscape. A delicate balance is sought to be maintained by the provision: though the main purpose is to keep the judicial review to a minimum to sustain the arbitral autonomy, at the same time, it incorporates the constitutional protections guaranteeing that the awards are in line with the principles of equity, legality, and public policy. The central question is therefore not whether courts should exercise review, but how narrowly and consistently that review should be exercised.

Research Questions

- What was the original legislative intent underlying Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, and how has that intent evolved through subsequent legislative amendments and judicial interpretations?
- What approach has the Indian judiciary adopted in interpreting ‘public policy’, ‘patent illegality’, ‘procedural irregularity’, and ‘jurisdictional error’ in proceedings seeking challenge to arbitral awards under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996?
- What factors contribute to delays in the adjudication of petitions challenging arbitral awards under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, despite the statutory time limit prescribed for their disposal?
- How effectively does the prevailing legal framework balance the principle of minimal judicial intervention with the need for courts to correct manifest errors and prevent legally untenable arbitral awards?

Statutory Framework and Conceptual Foundations

The bare reading and interpretation of Section 34 reflects the approach adopted by Article 34 of the UNCITRAL Model Law, which restricts the control of the Courts to clearly specified grounds. The rationale for the provision is to keep the arbitration process as private, and the arbitral awards must be honoured. Contrary to mechanism of an appeal in any prescribed law, the arbitral tribunal’s award can be set aside only on the grounds stated in the provision by the court, rather than an appeal permitting reconsideration of factual and legal conclusions.

Initially, the 1996 Act was a reflection of the Model Law but in the early years of its application, the courts interpreted Section 34 in a manner which expanded the scope of considerable judicial intervention in the Arbitral Proceedings. In decisions like ONGC v. Saw Pipes and ONGC v. Western Geco, the “public policy” ground was very broadly construed. The resulting expansion of review prompted legislative intervention and ultimately contributed to the narrower statutory formulation introduced by the 2015 Amendment. These continuing trends had the effect of defeating the very object of arbitration and hence the necessity of legislative intervention through amendments.

Evolution of Judicial Interpretation: Expansion and Correction through Legislation

The way of interpreting Section 34 by the judiciary has been significantly altered over the last two decades. The transformation can be conceived as a transition from an interference that was general and at the same time very deep, to a more restricted and pro-arbitration. The revolution is mainly contributed by the major declaration of the judiciary, the changes in the law books, and the adoption of a new policy to make India a pro-arbitration place. The following sub-parts narrate the sequence of events, demonstrating how the courts initially broadened the scope of interference, then adjusted, and finally had a new limited review model in their interpretation.

Pre 2015 Amendment Expansion: The Saw Pipes Era

The decision of ONGC v. Saw Pipes Ltd. in the year 2003 had a profound impact on the development of arbitration law. It was one of those cases that had the potential to change the very way in which arbitration is perceived in the area of legal litigation and therefore, it is worth mentioning that the Apex Court was the torchbearer of this transition. The Supreme Court equated Patent International Arbitration Matters a barrier to trade and discussed this and the implications of the decision in ONGC v. Saw Pipes (2003), leading to the next part of the same discussion.

The Supreme Court noted that a crucial aspect of international commercial arbitration is that it requires the effective implementation of the arbitration agreement by the parties, and thus the arbitral award enjoys the protection given to an agreement, and so in that light, "public policy of India" will include anything that shocks the court's conscience as such be rendered unenforceable because it is contrary to public policy of India. The decision significantly expanded the practical reach of Section 34 and subsequently became the subject of both doctrinal criticism and legislative response. The most violent debate regarding the level of judicial input and deference in cases of public policy challenges is likely to focus on the presence of such disputes.

The expansive use of public policy after Saw Pipes contributed to an increase in challenges to awards and generated concern that arbitration was losing the finality that distinguished it from ordinary litigation. The subsequent jurisprudence and the 2015 Amendment must therefore be viewed, in part, as an attempt to recalibrate that balance and prevent public policy from becoming a broad merits-review jurisdiction.

Western Geco Case: The Reasonableness Inquiry

In the case of ONGC v. Western Geco (2014), the Supreme Court raised the bar by incorporating general principles such as reasonableness, natural justice, and application of mind into the construction of the "fundamental policy of Indian law." The Court went on to say that a mistake in the treatment of crucial evidence or in the application of judicial reasoning was a violation of fundamental policy. The decision consequently enlarged the scope within which a court could examine the decision-making process adopted by an arbitral tribunal.

The door was thus in a way opened for the courts to sift through arbitrators findings on facts, the sufficiency of reasoning, and the quality of evidence. Although this was cloaked as a procedural review, Western Geco, in fact, stood for an re-evaluation similar to an appeal.

The Legislative Correction: Amendment Act, 2015

To counter the widening judiciary power, the Amendment Act of 2015 to the Arbitration and Conciliation Act was brought by the Parliament as a major restructuring of Section 34.

- **Public Policy**

When the Amendment Act of 2015 was passed, it required the term "public policy" to be taken in a narrow sense. These include awards affected by fraud or corruption or specified statutory violations, contravention of the fundamental policy of Indian law, and conflict with the most basic notions of morality or justice. Patent illegality was separately incorporated through Section 34 (2-A) as an additional ground applicable to domestic awards, including domestic awards other than international commercial arbitrations. The statutory proviso expressly excludes setting aside merely because of an erroneous application of law or because the court would reappreciate the evidence differently.

- **Prohibition on Review of Merits of the Case**

The very wording used by the Amendment indicates that the courts were not to undertake a retrial of evidence or substitute the findings which can be shown to be wrong. This alteration in the legislation marked a very diligent shift in policy, making Indian law equivalent to that of the international scenario which supports minimal judicial intervention.

- **Post-Amendment Judicial Approach**

After the 2015 Amendment, the Supreme Court's jurisprudence increasingly emphasised upon restraint on courts power to interfere with Arbitral Awards. The cases did not eliminate review however, they sought to ensure that intervention remained minimal and confined to the statutory grounds and does not become a mechanism for correcting errors put forth by an unsuccessful party. In the case of Ssangyong Engineering, the Apex Court reiterated the principle that a court cannot set aside an award merely because it might have interpreted the contract or assessed the evidence differently. The tribunal's conclusion must ordinarily stand where it represents a possible and legally sustainable view, subject only to the limited statutory grounds of challenge.

Similarly in Dyna Technologies Pvt. Ltd. Case, the new rule of interpretation which was a restrained approach was reinforced which was later followed in Delhi Airport Metro dispute as well. The decisions in the former cases did not entertain rehearing or even corrections on the part of the arbitral tribunal to rectify their misinterpretations to make it in conformity with law.

Procedural Framework under Section 34

Section 34 has received judicial interpretation which interprets the provisions as a supervisory authority instead of providing an appellate review system. The main purpose of this rule exists to protect arbitration awards from unauthorized interference which would disrupt the fundamental arbitration process. the court ordinarily examines the arbitral record rather than conducting a fresh trial, and the permissible grounds of intervention remain statutorily confined. The procedural framework provides insight into its operational strengths while simultaneously showing its essential weaknesses which emerge during actual execution.

Section 34(3) prescribes a limitation of 3 months after the passing and receipt of the Arbitral Award, subject to a further period of thirty days where sufficient cause is shown. The legislation makes it clear that no one can extend the time limit beyond the extra thirty days which shows that the lawmakers wanted to create permanent solutions while stopping extended legal battles.

The Supreme Court has consistently enforced these stricter timelines in its decisions. The Court ruled in Union of India v. Popular Construction Co. that Section 34(3) establishes an unchangeable limitation period which Section 5 of the Limitation Act 1963 cannot modify. The Apex Court’s decisions including Union of India v. Popular Construction Co. and Simplex Infrastructure Ltd. v. Union of India demonstrate that the court cannot use general provisions of limitation law to extend the period beyond the outer boundary prescribed by Section 34(3). The rule promotes certainty, although in practice governmental decision-making and internal approvals can make compliance more difficult for public bodies.

Section 34 limits court authority to oversee arbitration processes because it requires courts to follow only predefined statutory procedures, which differ from appellate proceedings that allow judges to examine facts and legal arguments. The court cannot evaluate evidence again to replace the tribunal's decision with its own judgment because it lacks that authority to do so. The legal principle has received strong support from multiple important judicial decisions Such as McDermott International Inc. v. Burn Standard Co. Ltd. determined that the court system cannot fix erroneous factual or legal points present in arbitral awards because they can only be invalidated through narrow conditions.

The Court established in Associate Builders v. Delhi Development Authority that Section 34 prohibits evidence reappraisal while award-specific evidence can only be challenged when it shows clear illegalities which violate public policy.

The judicial system requires more time to adjudicate cases because parties use delays as a strategy against their opponents and courts need to manage the case backlogs. The courts allow parties to submit extensive factual evidence which creates a violation of Section 34 that requires them to maintain limited control over proceedings.

The Supreme Court has consistently warned people against engaging in these unlawful activities. The Court in P.R. Shah, Shares & Stock Brokers Pvt. Ltd. v. B.H.H. Securities Pvt. Ltd. established that courts should only challenge arbitration awards when they find complete agreement about the factual details. The Court in Dyna Technologies Pvt. Ltd. v. Crompton Greaves Ltd. established that judges must refrain from investigating case details which constitute another form of prohibited interference.

The Supreme Court in Fiza Developers & Inter-Trade Pvt. Ltd. v. AMCI (India) Pvt. Ltd. established that Section 34 proceedings function as summary proceedings which do not require parties to develop issues or present witness testimony through civil suit procedures. The Court established that affidavits provide sufficient proof for most cases, while it permits oral testimony only for extraordinary situations. The case of Emkay Global Financial Services Ltd. v. Girdhar Sondhi established that cross-examination exists as an exceptional procedure which should not become standard practice because it disrupts the summary nature of legal proceedings.

The Section 34 mechanism enables narrow judicial oversight, but procedural issues obstruct its use as intended. The strict limitation period, which guarantees finality, creates difficulties because it prevents legal enforcement. The legal system recognizes the difference between an application and an appeal, which people frequently overlook in actual situations. The provision loses effectiveness because people extend hearings through unnecessary arguments, delays, and increases in evidence.

Key Challenges and Systemic Issues under Section 34

The major difficulties faced under Section 34 have remained unchanged even after the 2015 Amendment and legal developments which occurred thereafter. They also arise from the manner in which the grounds are pleaded and adjudicated. These issues are frequently a product of legal atmosphere, administrative weaknesses, and even misapplication of statutory grounds.

Misinterpretation of the Concept of Public Policy

Public policy is still the most commonly a misinterpreted factor, being that parties most of the time say that their disagreement in interpretation of the Agreement is a violation of the fundamental policy of the law, thus putting even more pressure on the courts to do more extensive analysis. Courts should insist on a demonstrable connection between the alleged defect and one of the categories recognised by Section 34(2)(b)(ii).

Reassessment of the Evidence of the Case

Judges have consistently cautioned lawyers for an extremely long time, while they keep on revisiting facts, evidence, and contract interpretation. When this occurs, the proceeding begins to resemble an appeal even though the statute does not confer appellate jurisdiction. The consequence of the same is not merely additional hearing time but the same also undermines confidence in the finality of the arbitral process. Furthermore, Cases that include technical contracts, government undertakings, or complex engineering proof are particularly likely to misuse. The court must still identify a legally cognisable defect before intervening.

Overburdened Courts

The large number of cases in commercial courts is a major reason for the delay in disposing of the cases under Section 34 of the Arbitration Act. The law intends to settle the dispute within the period of one year, but time and again the parties are left with a petition that may take several years to conclude, consequently reducing the desirability of arbitration as a means of dispute resolution.

Reliance on Broad Contractual Grounds

There are cases when Courts only come in based on an internal sense of fairness as opposed to the stipulated criteria. In disputes over the interpretation of the contract, Judges use external notions of fairness at times which destroys the idea of the sanctity of the contract.

Lack of Specialised Arbitration Benches

Lack of Specialised Arbitration benches is one of the greatest systematic issue faced by the Section 34 Petitions. An absolute lack of commercial or technical experience on the part of the bench may lead to various problems including contradictory interpretations, extension of matters that belong to the public domain and inappropriate patent illegality application.

Government as the Largest Litigant

Government entities constitute a significant category of arbitration users and litigants. It is the government that allows arbitration to be used in India with a greater percentage of disputes. The government by default formally challenges every award which causes a chain of inefficiency, courts overcrowding and make private parties discouraged to choose arbitration as an option.

Patent Illegality: Concept, Scope, and Pitfalls

Only domestic awards in India are subject to the ground of patent illegality which is enunciated under Section 34 (2A) of the Arbitration Act. The defect must appear on the face of the award and must be sufficiently serious to justify the challenge to the award. The correction of manifest errors and the preservation of arbitral autonomy can be seen as the main objective of this ground.

Understanding Patent Illegality

Patent illegality include disregard of a material contractual provision, a conclusion unsupported by the evidentiary record, or a finding that is so “perverse” that it cannot reasonably be sustained. The following are some examples of patent illegality:

- Failure to consider most significant clauses of the agreement
- Decisions made that have no proof to back them up
- Perverse or irrational findings
- Using evidence that is not in the case record

The threshold as applied by the Courts are exceptionally high since a broader approach would again convert the Section 34 jurisdiction into an appellate jurisdiction. The reviewing court must therefore distinguish a patent defect apparent from the award from an arguable error that could reasonably have been resolved in more than one way.

There is a consensus in the court rulings that improper or different interpretations never amount to patent illegality. The ground covered only includes those interpretations that are absolutely unreasonable to humanity. By doing so, the arbitral interpretation remains intact.

The Cases of Perverse Findings

A findings of the Arbitral Tribunal are said to be perverse in case:

- There is no evidence to support it
- It does not take into account some essential evidence
- It is ridiculous or in contradiction with established principles

The distinction is therefore one of degree as well as kind. Section 34 is concerned with exceptional defects, not with the correction of ordinary adjudicatory errors. A court should intervene only where the statutory threshold is demonstrably crossed.

Misapplication by the Courts

In practice, the courts sometimes see a violation of the law by the contracting party as an opportunity to go back to the interpretation of the contract they thought should have been applied. If unchecked, such misuse risks reopening the era when SAW Pipes were allowed to enter the Indian market under new names. Judicial discipline is, therefore, necessary to keep the credibility of the limited review system.

Public Policy: Narrow Construction and Judicial Trends

Public policy used to be the most contested ground under section 34 since the expansive approach associated with Saw Pipes and Western Geco, however, the same has gone significant narrowing following the Amendment Act of 2015.

- **Fundamental Policy of Indian Law**

Fundamental policy of Indian law should not be equated with a general requirement that the tribunal reach the legally ‘correct’ result in the eyes of the reviewing court. It concerns foundational principles of the Indian legal system which are:

  - Basic principles of judicial approach
  - Non-arbitrariness
  - Strict observance of the fundamental legal principles

The practical consequence is that the court must preserve the distinction between legality and correctness. An award may contain an arguable error and yet remain legally immune from setting aside if the error does not satisfy the statutory threshold.

- **Morality and Justice**

The morality and justice limb dwells with the principle of fundamental policy. Intervention is contemplated only where the award conflicts with the most basic notions of morality or justice, rather than where a result merely appears harsh on one party or commercially not feasible.The threshold is therefore exceptional. The reviewing court must identify circumstances that offend foundational standards of justice or morality; dissatisfaction with the outcome, without more, is insufficient.

- **Fraud and Corruption**

Fraud and corruption occupy a distinct place within the statutory concept of public policy. Allegations of this nature must, however, be connected to the making or legal validity of the award in the manner contemplated by Section 34. Suspicion, conjecture or an unsupported allegation cannot by itself justify setting aside of the Arbitral Award. However, to linking these charges to the award and as such, it must be irrefutably proven otherwise mere suspicion or speculation cannot lead to any relief.

Comparative Analysis of Section 34 and Global Trends

The understanding of how other countries handle challenges to arbitral awards is useful in confirming the method in which India handles such challenges and in suggesting the path going forward.

The UK courts take on a stance that does not allow for much outside intervention under the Arbitration Act and only allows interfere in cases of procedural faults or jurisdictional errors. Then, the only kind of appeals allowed are those concerning questions of law that have the consent of both parties, and those are almost never successful.

Singapore is very cautious in its approach. Judges are consistent about not admitting to any form of reopening of findings of fact, and interpreting public policy is done in a very strict manner. Speedy resolution of challenges makes for a more economically viable process.

Hong Kong being a pro-arbitration nation follows a system through its Arbitration Ordinance (Cap. 609) which establishes a strong framework for arbitration. The legal system operates according to UNCITRAL Model Law requirements while judicial bodies maintain complete judicial independence. The legal system interprets public policy in a restricted manner while prioritizing the enforcement of arbitral awards which prevents any examination of factual or legal matters. Hong Kong achieves high operational efficiency in handling set-aside applications which establishes its status as a major international arbitration centre.

Taken together, these jurisdictions reveal a broad international preference for judicial restraint, narrow public-policy standards and efficient procedures for challenging awards. The comparison does not suggest that India should replicate another jurisdiction mechanically; rather, it demonstrates that specialist judicial capacity, predictable thresholds and effective case management can coexist with meaningful judicial supervision.

Therefore**,** Judicial restraint, specialized courts, and strict timelines are techniques which improves the arbitration credibility significantly, as suggested by international experience if adopted. In India, the changes are being made but they need to be uniformly effective to produce the desired results.

Proposed Reforms to Improve the Efficiency of Section 34

The operational problems which Section 34 of the Arbitration Act face continue to exist despite numerous judicial rulings and legal changes. The courts have shown a dedication to restrict judicial review of arbitration results but the actual operation still face challenges and call for reforms in the legislation. The framework which controls Section 34 needs complete reform through structural, administrative and policy upgrades which should follow international standard practices.

The system needs major changes because it lacks necessary rules which require all parties to meet established time limits during legal proceedings. The statute establishes a one-year period for resolving Section 34 applications but organizations treat this requirement as a guidance instead of an obligation. Courts allow parties to delay proceedings which enables litigants to continue their fights through the system instead of reaching quick solutions through arbitration. The solution requires implementation of proper enforcement systems. Courts could adopt structured schedules for pleadings, hearings and judgments, conduct early identification of the precise statutory grounds relied upon, and discourage repetitive submissions or adjournments that do not materially advance the adjudication. The system needs regular judicial reviews of active cases to maintain accountability and prevent cases from becoming inactive.

The first problem with delays involves parties which uses dilatory tactics to prevent enforcement of arbitral awards. The practice of making baseless objections together with making repetitive requests to postpone and filing challenges through a standard process has become widespread among government officials. To address this issue, courts need to establish stricter enforcement policies by setting actual cost penalties which they will impose on parties who implement these techniques. The imposition of exemplary costs for baseless challenges and authority of courts to dismiss applications which do not meet the specific grounds established in Section 34 can act as a strong deterrent.

The establishment of these specialized benches will enhance judicial decision-making by providing judges with a framework to evaluate cases according to established international arbitration practices. Additionally, it will expedite case resolution since judges with arbitration knowledge will not consider arguments that exceed the limits of judicial examination.

The judicial system needs reforms while institutional arbitration must be promoted as a solution to challenges under Section 34. Institutional arbitration provides organizations with structured processes and administrative help which improves the enforcement ability and quality of their arbitration decisions.

Parties who choose institutional arbitration will decrease the number of Section 34 applications which will follow this decision. India needs to promote its arbitration institutions through better infrastructure and administrative efficiency and higher credibility. The shift to institutional arbitration will proceed faster through government assistance and public education programs and institutional arbitration incentives.

At the legislative and policy level, India's arbitration framework should continue to align with internationally accepted principles while responding to domestic institutional realities. Greater precision in the application of public policy, clearer procedural expectations and stronger enforcement of time limits would reduce uncertainty without compromising legitimate judicial oversight.

The government agencies need to undergo a complete assessment of their current responsibilities within the arbitration process. The government operates as a major litigant which creates substantial delays because it frequently disputes arbitral awards. The organization needs to establish a precise policy framework which will restrict unnecessary disputes while enhancing adherence to arbitration rulings.

Section 34 has experienced both substantial judicial analysis and legislative updates but its operational effectiveness continues to be limited by structural problems. The solution to these problems requires multiple strategies which include enforcing time limits and preventing procedural misconduct and creating dedicated arbitration panels and advancing institutional arbitration.

Conclusion

Section 34 of the Arbitration Act highlights an intricate trade-off between two primary aims: safeguarding the time-bound character of arbitration awards, and, at the same time, upkeeping the arbitral process to be just, legal, and in tune with public policy. Courts decisions in past two decades have demonstrated a shift of an active and erratic public policy doctrine period, predominantly to a milder, international-oriented one. Needless to state that the continuous abuse of Section 34 as a cloaked appeal and the disregard for the stipulated time limits still harm the process of arbitration in India.

In order for Section 34 to work effectively, courts should be very strict in applying the limited scope of reviewing, prevent rediscussion of evidence, and guarantee timely resolution of petitions. Legislation should also be updated to remove the procedural barriers and clarifying ambiguities that cause different interpretations by different benches. Making institutional arbitration stronger, improving the training of judges and accepting cost and penalties for frivolous challenges could be seen as the main factor of progress. Through the changes in the Section 34 system, India will be able to make its arbitration environment stronger and also create certainty and credibility of the arbitral awards.

References

1. Associate Builders v. Delhi Development Authority, (2015) 3 SCC 49 (India).
2. Bhaven Construction v. Executive Engineer, Sardar Sarovar Narmada Nigam Ltd. & Anr., (2022) 1 SCC 75 (India).
3. Delhi Airport Metro Express Pvt. Ltd. v. Delhi Metro Rail Corporation Ltd., (2022) 1 SCC 131 (India).
4. Dyna Technologies Pvt. Ltd. v. Crompton Greaves Ltd., (2019) 20 SCC 1 (India).
5. Emkay Global Financial Services Ltd. v. Girdhar Sondhi, (2018) 9 SCC 49 (India).
6. Fiza Developers & Inter-Trade Pvt. Ltd. v. AMCI (India) Pvt. Ltd., (2009) 17 SCC 796 (India).
7. McDermott International Inc. v. Burn Standard Co. Ltd., (2006) 11 SCC 181 (India).
8. National Highways Authority of India v. M. Hakeem & Anr., (2021) 9 SCC 1 (India).
9. ONGC Ltd. v. Saw Pipes Ltd., (2003) 5 SCC 705 (India).
10. ONGC Ltd. v. Western Geco International Ltd., (2014) 9 SCC 263 (India).
11. P.R. Shah, Shares & Stock Brokers (P) Ltd. v. B.H.H. Securities (P) Ltd., (2012) 1 SCC 594 (India).
12. Ssangyong Engineering & Construction Co. Ltd. v. National Highways Authority of India, (2019) 15 SCC 131 (India).
13. UHL Power Co. Ltd. v. State of Himachal Pradesh, (2022) 4 SCC 116 (India).
14. Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, No. 26 of 1996 (India).

15. United Nations Commission on International Trade Law. (2006). *UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration (1985), with amendments as adopted in 2006*. United Nations. https://uncitral.un.org/en/texts/arbitration/modellaw/commercial_arbitration (accessed July 17, 2026).

16. Dunna, G. T. (2016). Prospective applicability of Section 34 under the Arbitration Amendment Act, 2015. *National Law School Business Law Review, 2*, 30.

https://ssrn.com/abstract=3045650 (accessed July 20, 2026).

17. Kumar, R., & Rawat, P. (2022). Scope of arbitrability and public policy as a ground for setting aside an arbitral award under Section 34 of the Indian Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996. *Sambodhi Indological Research Journal*.

https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4146634 (accessed July 20, 2026).

18. Maniktala, N., & Singhal, A. (2021). Decoding: The Arbitration and Conciliation (Amendment) Ordinance, 2020 vis-à-vis Section 34(2)(b)(ii) of the Arbitration & Conciliation Act, 1996. *SSRN / MCO Legals Knowledge Bank*. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4962469 (accessed July 21, 2026).

19. Nanda, A., & Bhullar, F. S. (2023). Analysis of Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act—Setting aside of arbitral award and courts' interference: An evaluation with case laws. *International Journal of Novel Research and Development*.

https://ijnrd.org/papers/IJNRD2310279.pdf (accessed July 22, 2026).

20. Paneru, P. (2023). Section 34 of the Arbitration & Conciliation Act, 1996: Decoding the public policy of India. *Indian Journal of Law and Legal Research*. https://www.ijllr.com/post/section-34-of-the-arbitration-conciliation-act-1996-decoding-the-publc-policy-of-india (accessed August 2, 2026).

21. Prasanna, G. S., & Singh, A. (2025). Judicial review of arbitral awards: Analyzing Section 34 under the Arbitration and Conciliation Act. *International Journal of Legal Science and Innovation*. https://ijlsi.com/paper/judicial-review-of-arbitral-awards-analyzing-section-34-under-the-arbitration-and-conciliation-act/ (accessed August 9, 2026).

22. Shastri, S. (2025). Judicial review under Section 34 of the Arbitration & Conciliation Act, 1996: An analysis of the courts' power to modify arbitral awards. *CMR University Journal for Dispute Settlement and Arbitration*. https://cmr.edu.in/school-of-legal-studies/adr-journal/wp-content/uploads/2025/06/08.-Judicial-Review-under-Section-34-of-the-Arbitration-Conciliation-Act.pdf (accessed August 12, 2026).

❑❑❑