

**HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH
AT JAMMU
(Through Virtual Mode)**

Arb P No.86/2026

**M/S Allied Sales Services Th. Arun
Prakash Gupta**

...Petitioner(s)

Through: Mr. Ansh Gupta, Advocate vice
Mr. Ravi Abrol, Advocate.

Vs.

**Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd. Th. Chief
General Manager, Jammu and Others.**

...Respondent(s)

Through: Mr. Jugpal Singh, Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY PARIHAR, JUDGE

ORDER
25.09.2026

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties. This Court, vide order dated 2nd May, 2024, appointed Ms. Deepika Mahajan, learned Senior Advocate, High Court of J&K and Ladakh, as the sole arbitrator to adjudicate upon the disputes between the parties, including all preliminary objections, if any, pertaining to the subject matter of the proceedings.
2. As submitted by learned counsel for the parties, the arbitral proceedings are presently pending before the Arbitral Tribunal. In the interregnum, the petitioner has filed the instant application seeking extension of the mandate of the learned sole arbitrator. No objections to the application have been filed by the respondent.

3. Learned counsel for the respondent submits that the delay in conclusion of the arbitral proceedings is attributable to the petitioner. It is further submitted that the parties had, by mutual consent, extended the mandate of the learned Arbitral Tribunal for a period of six months, which extension expired on 1st November, 2025. Thereafter, this Court extended the mandate up to 3rd May, 2026. The arbitral proceedings, however, could not be concluded within the said extended period.
4. The aforesaid submissions are controverted by learned counsel for the petitioner, who submits that, instead of addressing final arguments in the matter, the respondent has filed two separate applications before the learned Arbitral Tribunal, one seeking rejection of the claim petition and the other being a miscellaneous application, thereby delaying the proceedings, particularly when the matter had reached the stage of final conclusion.
5. The mandate of the learned Arbitral Tribunal having expired on 3rd May, 2026, an extension thereof is necessary to enable the learned sole arbitrator to bring the arbitral proceedings to their logical conclusion. Having considered the objections raised by learned counsel for the respondent, this Court finds no merit therein. Once the respondent chose to file applications before the learned Arbitral Tribunal, the petitioner was necessarily entitled to file objections/replies thereto. Whether any delay was occasioned on account of the

petitioner in filing such objections/replies is a matter which may appropriately be considered by the learned arbitrator.

6. Arbitral proceedings are intended to secure an expeditious resolution of disputes and, therefore, ought to be brought to a conclusion at the earliest. Undue prolongation of such proceedings would defeat the very object underlying the arbitral mechanism.
7. In view of the foregoing, the mandate of the learned Arbitral Tribunal, which expired on 3rd May, 2026, is hereby extended for a further period of six months with effect from the date of expiry of the last extension. The learned sole arbitrator is requested to endeavour to conclude the arbitral proceedings within the aforesaid extended period and to dispose of the same in accordance with law.
8. The application stands ***disposed of*** accordingly.

(Sanjay Parihar)
Judge

SRINAGAR:

25.09.2026

Shaista-PS