

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Request Case No.209 of 2017

=====

Kamlesh Yadav, son of Mukti Ray, Proprietor of M/S Raj Rice Mill, resident of
Village-Chainpur, P.O.-Bhawanipur Bazar, P.S.-Adapur, District-East Champaran
.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Bihar State Food & Civil Supplies Corporation Limited Through Its
Managing Director, Office at Khadya Bhawan, Daroga Prasad Path, R.
Block, Road No. 2, Patna-800001
2. The Managing Director, Bihar State Food & Civil Supplies Corporation
Limited, Office at Khadya Bhawan, Daroga Prasad Path, R-Block, Road No.
2, Patna-800001
3. The District Manager, Bihar State Food & Civil Supplies Corporation
Limited, Motihari, District-East Champaran

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sumeet Kumar Singh

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 08-11-2017

In identical proceedings i.e. in Request Case No.

8 of 2016 and various other analogous cases, a detailed order has been
passed by me on 19.04.2017 allowing an application under Section
11(6) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act and an Arbitral Tribunal
has been constituted. In this application also, the respondents herein
had entered into an agreement with the appellant and the issues,
identical in nature, have been referred for arbitration on 19.04.2017.
As identical issues are involved in the matter which have already been
considered on 19.04.2017 in Request No. 8/2016 and other cases and
as the same objections are raised herein, I see no reason to take a
different view from the one already taken by me on 19.04.2017 when
a series of cases detailed hereinabove were disposed of.



The objection of the respondents that the matter is pending before the Hon’ble Supreme Court in an S.L.P cannot be a ground for postponing the matter as on earlier occasion adjournment is taken on this very ground. That apart, the contention of depositing the amount is not a ground for refusing arbitration, but a ground to be raised by the respondents before the Arbitrator and the consequential effect taken note of by the Arbitrator.

For the reasons and grounds indicated in the order dated 19.04.2017, this application is allowed.

Justice (Retired) V. Nath is appointed as Arbitrator to adjudicate the dispute. However, in these proceedings this Court has not gone into the merits of various objections raised with regard to maintainability of the dispute. In view of the certificate proceedings held, the question of limitation and all other issues are left open to be canvassed by the parties before the Arbitrator.

(Rajendra Menon, CJ)

Shageer/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	14/11/2017
Transmission Date	NA

