

\$~

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

37

+

O.M.P. 471/2015 &IA 18680/2015, 9545/2016

TAURANT PROJECTS LTD

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr.Ashok Kumar, Advocate

versus

MAHARASHTRA NATURAL GAS LIMITED..... Respondent

Through: Mr. S.S. Ray, Mr. A.K. Melwani, Mr.
A.K.Rudra, Ms. Rakhi Ray, Mr. Vaibhav Golia,
Advocates.

CORAM: JUSTICE S.MURALIDHAR

ORDER

%

02.11.2016

1. At the outset, learned counsel for the Respondent clarifies that the statement made before the Court on 12th July 2016 that the Petitioner has already filed a petition under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 before the Court of Pune was not correct. He submits that subsequently he was instructed that the said petition pertains to another Award in the dispute between the parties and not to the Award which has been impugned in the present petition.

2. With the Petitioner having already approached the Court at Pune as regards the other Award in the arbitral proceedings between the parties which also like in the present case took place in Pune, the question of entertaining the present petition by this Court does not arise. In fact here too the works were executed in Maharashtra and the contract provides for the

exclusive jurisdiction of the Courts of the State of Maharashtra.

3. In that view of the matter, the present petition is dismissed on the ground of lack of territorial jurisdiction. It will be open to the Petitioner to approach the appropriate Court in accordance with law. The pending applications are disposed of.

S.MURALIDHAR, J

NOVEMBER 02, 2016
mg