

\$~11

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

+ O.M.P.(I) (COMM.) 207/2018

V R TECHNICHE CONSULTANTS PVT. LTD. .... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sunil Singh Parihar, Adv

versus

INDIAN HIGHWAYS MANAGEMENT COMPANY  
LIMITED

..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Soumya Priyadarshinee with Ms.  
Kritika Shukla and Mr. Shubham  
Shankar Saxena, Advs

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER**

**ORDER**

% **27.11.2018**

1. Ms. Soumya Priyadarshinee, who, appears for the respondent, has placed before me the Minutes of Meeting dated 19.11.2018 at which the representatives of both the petitioner and respondent no. 1 were present.

2. The said Minutes of Meeting read as follows:-

***“Item No. 1: To discuss on settlement of dispute for Traffic Survey Project.***

*It was discussed during the meeting that the rate quoted for Traffic Survey Project (phase-III) is very less in comparison to the rate of Traffic Survey Project (Phase-I). Accordingly, there is possibility of saving the substantial amount of money in the interest of public exchequer.*

*Therefore, the committee proposed two options to M/s VR Techniche Consultants Pvt. Ltd. as per below:-*

*a) to conduct the balance traffic surveys as per rate quoted by L1 agency of phase-III.*

*b) to abide by the Legal process.*

*During discussion with representatives of M/s VR Techniche Consultants Pvt. Ltd. for the above said proposal, they confirmed their reply for the abovementioned (a) option above.*

*The representative of M/s VR Techniche Consultants Pvt. Ltd. gave their consent that they agree to match the rate of L1 agency of Phase-III RFP.”*

3. According to Ms. Priyadarshinee, in view of what has been decided at the meeting dated 19.11.2018, there is presently no dispute obtaining between the parties and therefore, the petition need not be actioned further.

4. The record shows that the counsel for the parties had been taking time to arrive at a settlement. Since a settlement has been arrived at, to my mind, nothing survives in the captioned petition.

5. In any event, the captioned petition has been filed under Section 9 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, therefore, in my opinion, no relief can be granted at this juncture in the captioned petition.

6. The petition is, accordingly, disposed of.

7. Accordingly, the interim order dated 07.05.2018 shall stand vacated.

8. *Dasti* under the signatures of Court Master.

**RAJIV SHAKDHER, J**

**NOVEMBER 27, 2018**

**c**