

\$~9

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

+ **W.P.(C) 4570/2017 & CM No. 19917/2017**

M/S KATYAYINI PAPER MILLS PVT LTD Petitioner

Through: Mr Apar Gupta, Mr Ravinder Singh,
Ms Garima Jain and Ms Disha Gupta,
Advocates.

versus

DIRECTORATE GENERAL OF SUPPLIES
& DISPOSAL AND ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Mr Bhagvan Swarup Shukla, CGSC
with Mr Shambhu Chaturvedi,
Advocate.
Mr P. S. Khurana and Mr Vibhor
Sushant Pal and Mr Rajiv Mishra,
Advocates for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

% **11.07.2017**

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the letter dated 20.01.2017 and a Show Cause Notice dated 25.04.2017 issued by respondent no.2.
2. The disputes between the parties arise from the contract entered into between the petitioner and respondent no.2 for supply of paper at DGS&D rates.
3. It is stated that the petitioner had already moved an application for appointment of an arbitrator to adjudicate the said disputes as according to the petitioner an arbitration agreement exists between the parties.

4. At the outset, learned counsel for the respondent states that the respondent shall comply with the order dated 26.05.2017 and in the event respondent no.2 seeks to blacklist the petitioner, it would do so only after issuing Show Cause Notice and after the petitioner is allowed an opportunity to be heard.

5. Notwithstanding the aforesaid submission, learned counsel for respondent no.2 also states that this Court does not have the jurisdiction to entertain the present petition. According to him, the Courts in Punjab and Chandigarh will have exclusive jurisdiction with regard to the subject matter of the disputes, particularly, for the reason that the agreement between the petitioner and respondent no.2 was entered into at Mohali.

6. Without going into the controversy as to whether this Court has jurisdiction to entertain the present petition, it is apparent that no further orders are required to be passed in this petition in view of the statement made by the learned counsel for respondent no.2 that respondent no.2 would abide by the order dated 26.05.2017. Further, since according to the petitioner, there is an arbitration agreement between the parties, the petitioner has an efficacious remedy for other reliefs.

7. Accordingly, the petition and the pending application are disposed of.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

JULY 11, 2017
MK