

Atul

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
IN ITS COMMERCIAL DIVISION
COMM ARBITRATION PETITION NO. 1411 OF 2019**

Mphasis Ltd	...Petitioner
<i>Versus</i>	
Mahaonline Ltd	...Respondent

Mr Swanand Ganoo, *i/b Rajesh Ravindram, for the Petitioner.*
Mr S Khan, *with Mr A Kingaonkar, i/b India Law LLP, for the*
Respondent.

CORAM: G.S. PATEL, J.
DATED: 14th November 2019

PC:-

1. The petition is under Section 29-A of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act 1996 for an extension of time to complete the arbitration. The learned sole arbitrator entered upon the reference to his arbitration pursuant to an order of this court dated 13th April 2018. There was an initial extension of six months by consent. The arbitral mandate ended on 14th October 2019. The petition sets out in a chart that is annexed at Exhibit 'D' the progress that has been made in arbitration. It appears from this that evidence is being taken. In at least two scheduled meetings, the witness was unavailable. The list of dates also shows that the respondents sought a postponement more than once. It is not possible, therefore, to

attribute the delay entirely to one side or the other. Obviously, during the course of arbitration such exigencies will arise. The fact remains that the arbitration has proceeded to the stage of evidence after pleadings were completed and documents marked.

2. I will, therefore, extend the time for a period of one year from today to complete the arbitration.

3. All parties will endeavour to complete the arbitration at the earliest. Both sides agree that they will not seek unnecessary adjournments and their witnesses will be available on previously scheduled dates, barring an absolute emergency.

4. The petition is disposed of in these terms. There will be no order as to costs.

(G. S. PATEL, J)