

\$~13

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **O.M.P.(I) 26/2015 &**
IA Nos. 5027/2015, 21192/2015, 15169/2016 and 2724/2016

MVL LIMITED

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Parag Tripathi, Senior Advocate
with Ms. Udit Singh and Ms. Atikant, Advocates.

versus

KRRISH REALTECH PVT. LTD.& ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Jayant K. Mehtra, Ms. Bina Gupta,
Mr. Abhay Jena, Advocates for Respondent No.1.
Mr. Abhimanyu Mahajan, Mr. Milan Deep Singh
and Ms. Anubha Goel, Advocates for Respondent
No.2.

CORAM: JUSTICE S. MURALIDHAR

ORDER

06.12.2016

%

1. Mr. Parag Tripathi, learned Senior counsel for the Petitioner, contends that though the Petitioner was offered inspection of the lands purportedly earmarked for it, it transpired that the plots shown were either agricultural lands or had equipments.

2. In reply both Respondents 1 and 2 state that although the layout plan has been approved the actual development work will start only after the zoning is done.

3. Learned counsel for the Respondent No.2 has handed over in the Court, with a copy to learned counsel for the Petitioner, a clearer copy of the layout plan which is also available on website of Respondent No.2. This is

in colour. The plots earmarked for the Petitioner have been shaded in blue in the said layout plan.

4. Mr. Tripathi required the Respondents to clarify that the said plots actually belong to Respondents 1 and 2 and that there are no other third party interests qua the said properties. Learned counsel for Respondents 1 and 2 state on instructions, without prejudice to their rights and contentions about the entitlement of the Petitioner, that the rights in respect of the plots in question are with Respondents 1 and 2 and to the best of their knowledge there are no third party interests created vis-a-vis the said plots earmarked for the Petitioner.

5. The arbitration proceedings are already in progress before the Arbitral Tribunal (AT). The Court considers it appropriate to direct that further interim reliefs can be sought by the parties by filing appropriate applications in the arbitral proceedings.

6. The interim order passed by this Court on 20th February 2015 as modified by the order dated 11th March 2015 is directed to continue till such time the AT passes an order varying, modifying or vacating the said order in accordance with law in an application filed by either party.

7. The petition and the pending applications are disposed of in the above terms.

8. Order *dasti*.

S. MURALIDHAR, J

DECEMBER 06, 2016/dn