

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

APPEAL UNDER ARBITRATION ACT NO. 13 OF 2019

ANTONY NEERAJ PIUS.,

... Appellant

Versus

**BUOYANCY CONSULTANTS AND
ENGINEERING LLP, THR. ITS
ASSISTANT MANAGER.,**

... Respondent

WITH

APPEAL UNDER ARBITRATION ACT NO. 14 OF 2019

ANANTHA KRISHNAN.,

... Appellant

Versus

**BUOYANCY CONSULTANTS AND
ENGINEERING LLP, THR. ITS
ASSISTANT MANAGER.,**

... Respondent

Adv. Eeshan Usapkar for the Appellant.

Adv. Mr. Abhishek Sawant for the Respondent.

Coram:- DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU, J.

Date:- 24th January 2020

Oral Order:

The respondent invoked section 9 of Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 ("Arbitration Act"), and approached the District Court for interim relief. That was granted. Assailing that relief, the petitioner has filed this Appeal under section 37 of the Arbitration Act.

2. In response to the submissions made by the appellant's counsel, the respondent has submitted that the matter has become infructuous. According to him, the District Court in its interim direction imposed a time-cap of 30 months. That should run from the date of the appellant's appointment. Now, that period has ended.

3. In response, the appellant's counsel asserts that there is a particular observation in the impugned order that may affect the appellant's rights in the arbitration the respondent has initiated.

Under these circumstances, I reckon, as rightly contended by the respondent's counsel, what is impugned is only the interim order. Now, that interim order has been spent. As to the observations, I clarify that those observations, if any, will not bind the Administrative Tribunal, nor do they affect the rights of the parties to the arbitration proceedings.

DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU, J.

ap/-