

\$~22

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ O.M.P. 164/2015 & I.A. No.2722/2015 (for stay)

M/S. TECLINO FORGE LIMITED & ORS. Petitioners

Through Mr.Bhagabati Prasad Padhy, Adv.

versus

M/S. S.E. INVESTMENTS LIMITED Respondent

Through Mr.Anand M. Mishra, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN SINGH

ORDER

% **18.02.2016**

On 6th February, 2015 the following order was passed which reads as under:-

“1. Learned counsel for the Petitioners refers to Annexure P-3 which is the calculation submitted by the Petitioners to the learned Arbitrator in terms of which the amount due as on 12th July 2013, even according to the Petitioners, was Rs.52,83,746.

2. The Petitioners also admit that on the same basis the amount due as of today i.e. 6th February 2015, together with the admitted rate of interest up-to-date is owed to the Respondent. Consequently, conditional upon the Petitioners paying to the Respondent the aforementioned admitted amount with interest calculated on the same basis as indicated in Annexure P-3 up to the date of payment within eight weeks from today, notice is issued confined to the question as to the remaining amount including interest payable by the Petitioners to the Respondent.

3. The arbitral record be collected and filed by the Respondent in the Registry within four weeks.

4. Within eight weeks after the receipt of the arbitral record, the parties will file their respective written synopsis of arguments with reference to the pagination in the arbitral record. The parties will also prepare and file their respective convenience files for easy reference of the Court.

5. List before the Joint Registrar ('JR') on 27th May 2015 for completion of the above steps.

6. After completion of the above steps, list before the Court on 27th August 2015.

I.A No.2722/2015 (for stay)

7. On account of the pendency of the petition, no further orders are required in this application.

8. The application is disposed of.”

The said order was not complied by the petitioners for the last more than one year. The amount in view of the statement was supposed to be paid by the petitioners to the respondent which has not been paid. The petition is accordingly dismissed.

MANMOHAN SINGH, J.

FEBRUARY 18, 2016/vp