



CNR: KAHC010587192026

NC: 2026:KHC:52413
WP No. 26872 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 23RD DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. V. ARAVIND

WRIT PETITION NO. 26872 OF 2026 (GM-CPC)

BETWEEN:

MRS. RENU KAPOOR
W/O MR. MADHU KAPOOR,
AGED ABOUT 70 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO. B-302,
BELLANDUR POST, OUTER RING ROAD,
MANTRI ESPANA, KARIYAMMANNA AGARAHARA
BANGALORE-560103

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VAIBHAV RAVI MALIMATH.,ADVOCATE)

AND:

MR. T R RAMACHANDRA
S/O SRI. T. R. RAJAN,
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS,
HAVING OFFICE AT SHILPA SUNSHINE,
NO. 5, 27TH CROSS, 6TH MAIN ROAD,
JAYANAGAR 3RD BLOCK,
BENGALURU-560011

...RESPONDENT

(VIDE ORDER DATED 23.09.2026 NOTICE TO
RESPONDENT IS DISPENSED WITH)

Digitally
signed by
VINUTHA B S
Location:
High Court of
Karnataka



CNR: KAHC010587192026

NC: 2026:KHC:52413
WP No. 26872 of 2026

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASHING THE ORDER DATED 10.08.2026 PASSED BY THE LEARNED COMMERCIAL COURT AT BENGALURU IN COM. AA NO. 108 OF 2026 (ANNEXURE E), TO THE EXTENT THAT IT DIRECTS THE EXTENSION OF THE MANDATE OF THE ARBITRAL TRIBUNAL IN A.C. NO. 231 OF 2024 TO OPERATE FOR A PERIOD OF SIX MONTHS FROM 17.03.2026,

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR ORDERS, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. V. ARAVIND

ORAL ORDER

Heard Sri.Vaibhav Ravi Malimath, learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. The present petition is filed impugning the order dated 10.08.2026, whereby corrections have been carried out in exercise of the power under Section 152 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (hereinafter referred to as 'CPC').

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the period of twelve months, along with the further period of six months provided under Section 29A of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act'), expired on 05.03.2026. In view of sub-section (4) of Section



CNR: KAHC010587192026

29A of the Act, 1996, an application is permissible even after expiry of the mandate of the Arbitral Tribunal. Accordingly, the application came to be filed on 17.03.2026.

4. Learned counsel submits that the Trial Court rightly granted the extension. However, the extension was granted from the date of the order dated 07.07.2026. Therefore, an application under Section 152 of the CPC was filed seeking correction of the operative portion of the order, so as to extend the period from 05.03.2026, i.e., the date of expiry of the further period of six months.

5. It is submitted that, when Section 29A of the Act, enables the Court to extend the time, such extension ought to be from the date of expiry of the earlier period.

6. Considering the limited issue involved in the present petition, which is not likely to prejudice the rights of the respondent, notice to the respondent is dispensed with.

7. The application having been filed, this Court has considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the



CNR: KAHC010587192026

NC: 2026:KHC:52413
WP No. 26872 of 2026

petitioner. The application under Section 29A of the Act, was filed seeking extension of time by six months from 05.03.2026, which is the date of expiry of the further period of six months mutually consented to by the parties. On a plain reading of the language of Section 29A of the Act, an application seeking extension of time by the Court is permissible even after expiry of the time prescribed.

8. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in ***Ajay Protech Private Limited v. General Manager and Another, (2026) 7 SCC 452***, has held that, under sub-section (4) of Section 29A of the Act, an application for extension of time is maintainable even after expiry of the prescribed period. When the language of Section 29A of the Act, provides for extension of time, such extension necessarily has to operate from the date of expiry of the earlier period. No doubt, the proviso to sub-section (4) of Section 29A of the Act, provides that the mandate shall not lapse during the pendency of an application seeking extension. However, the extension granted by the Court has to necessarily take effect from the date of expiry of the earlier period.



**NC: 2026:KHC:52413
WP No. 26872 of 2026**

CNR: KAHC010587192026

9. In that view of the matter, only limited intervention is warranted. The extension granted by the Trial Court under the order dated 07.07.2026, as modified by the order dated 10.08.2026, shall take effect from 05.03.2026, as prayed for in the application.

10. With the above observations, the writ petition stands disposed of.

In the light of observation made herein above, the pending I.As., if any, stand disposed of.

**Sd/-
(K. V. ARAVIND)
JUDGE**