

\$~29

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

+ **O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 332/2018**

**SARVESH SECURITY SERVICE PVT LTD** ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Charu Tyagi, proxy counsel

versus

**DIRECTOR (MEDICAL) DELHI** ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Yakesh Anand with Mr. Nimit Mathur, Advs

**CORAM:**

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

**ORDER**

% **02.11.2018**

**I.A. No. 15261/2018 (Exemption)**

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

**O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 332/2018**

2. Issue notice.

3. Mr. Yakesh Anand accepts notice on behalf of the respondent.

4. Learned counsel for the respondent says that he does not wish to file a reply as he does not object to the prayer made in the petition for extension of time.

5. The record shows that this Court vide order dated 01.05.2017, passed in Arb. Petition No. 254/2017, had appointed a sole Arbitrator for adjudication of disputes between the parties.

6. From a perusal of the record, it emerges that parties had agreed to a six months extension of time after expiry of the statutory period of 12

months.

*O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 332/2018*

*page 1 of 2*

7. I am told by counsel for the respondent that though the matter was fixed for final arguments, an application was moved by the respondent for filing additional documents.

8. I am further informed by counsel for the respondent that matter is fixed before the Arbitral Tribunal on 09.11.2018.

9. It is in these circumstances that a prayer is made for extension of time.

10. Having regard to the time and money invested by the parties, further four months are granted for concluding the arbitration proceedings commencing from 25.11.2018.

11. The petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

12. *Dasti.*

**RAJIV SHAKDHER, J**

**NOVEMBER 02, 2018**

**c**

*O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 332/2018*

*page 2 of 2*