

\$~6

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

+ **ARB.P. 706/2017**

GURDEEP SINGH

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr Jasmeet Singh and Ms Astha
Sharma, Advocates.

versus

TDI INFRASTRUCTURE LTD.

..... Respondent

Through: Mr Anil Sapra, Senior Advocate with
Mr Sarthak Katyal and Mr Jaideep
Singh, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

%

28.02.2018

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 11 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (hereafter 'the Act'), *inter alia*, praying that an arbitrator be appointed to adjudicate the disputes that are stated to have arisen between the concerned parties in connection with the Buyer's Agreement dated 30.01.2010 (hereafter 'the Agreement').
2. The Agreement contains an arbitration clause, which is set out below:-

“ARTICLE 17

ARBITRATION

1. All disputes, differences or disagreement arising out of, in connection with or in relation to this Agreement shall be mutually discussed and settled between the Parties.
2. All disputes, differences or disagreement arising out of, in connection with or in relation to this Agreement,

which cannot be amicably settled, shall be finally decided by arbitration to be held in accordance with the provisions of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996. Any arbitration as aforesaid shall be a domestic arbitration under the Applicable Law.

3. The venue of arbitration shall be New Delhi or such other place as may be mutually agreed between the Parties and the language of arbitration shall be English.
4. The arbitration shall take place before the sole arbitrator, appointed by the First Party. The award shall be rendered in English Language.”

3. The petitioner further claims that a notice dated 21.08.2017 invoking the arbitration clause was issued to the respondent; however, the petitioner did not receive any response to the same.

4. Mr Sapra, the learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent contested the claim that the notice dated 21.08.2017 invoking the arbitration clause had been sent to the respondent. He submitted that, in any case, the respondent had not received the same. Mr Sapra further contended that in terms of Article 17 of the Agreement, the parties are required to attempt to resolve their disputes amicably before proceeding for arbitration.

5. The petitioner has also annexed a postal receipt for the dispatch of the notice dated 21.08.2017 and in this view, this Court is inclined to accept that the notice invoking the arbitration clause was duly served on the respondent.

6. There is no dispute regarding the existence of an arbitration clause. The parties are also agreeable that in the event the disputes remain unresolved, the parties be referred to arbitration under the aegis of Delhi International Arbitration Centre (DIAC).

7. In view of the above, the parties are directed to appear before Coordinator, DIAC on 01.05.2018. The Arbitrator shall be appointed under the Rules of DIAC. The arbitration shall be conducted under the aegis of DIAC and in accordance with its Rules.

8. In the meanwhile, the parties are also referred to Delhi High Court Mediation and Conciliation Centre (DHCMCC) for attempting to resolve their disputes amicably. The parties shall appear before DHCMCC on 05.03.2018 at 03:30 p.m.

9. The parties shall endeavour to resolve their disputes amicably. If the disputes are resolved amicably, the same will be communicated to the Coordinator, DIAC and he would not be required to take any further steps in furtherance of the arbitral proceedings. However, if the parties are unable to resolve their disputes by 27.04.2018, the parties shall appear before Coordinator, DIAC as directed.

10. It is clarified that all rights and contentions of the parties are kept open.

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

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

FEBRUARY 28, 2018
RK