



WEB COPY



Arb.O.P.(Com.Div.)No.133 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 29.04.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE **M.SUNDAR**

Arb.O.P.(Com.Div.)No.133 of 2022

The New India Assurance Company Ltd.,
(Represented by its Regional Manager)
having its office at 3rd Floor,
Dewa Towers, 770-A, Anna Salai
Chennai-600 002.

... Petitioner

vs.

M/s.Ranchi Expressways Ltd.,
(Represented by its Director)
Having office at "Madhucon House"
112/9A Road, No.36 Jubilee Hills
Hyderabad, Telangana.

... Respondent

Original Petition filed under Section 11(6)(a) & (c) of the Arbitration and Conciliation (Amendment) Act, 2015 read with Rule 2 of Appointment of Arbitrators of Madras High Court Scheme 1996 praying

(a) for appointing a Presiding Arbitrator to decide the dispute between the petitioner and the respondent arising out of the claim made by the petitioner to the respondents under the CAR Policy bearing Policy No.71070144170300000001 issued by petitioner Insurance company in favour of the respondent;



Arb.O.P.(Com.Div.)No.133 of 2022

(b) for the cost of this petition;

For Petitioner : Mr.S.R.Sundar
For Respondent : Mr.Adarsh Subramanian

ORDER

This order will now dispose of the captioned 'Arbitration Original Petition' [hereinafter 'Arb OP' for the sake of brevity and convenience].

2. This order is to be read in conjunction with and in continuation of proceedings made by this Court on 23.03.2022 when the captioned Arb OP was listed before this Court in the Admission Board. This 23.03.2022 proceedings of this Court reads as follows:

Proceedings dated 23.03.2022:

'Captioned 'Arbitration Original Petition' [hereinafter 'Arb OP' for the sake of convenience and clarity] has been presented in this Court on 04.03.2022 inter alia under Section 11(6) of 'The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (Act No.26 of 1996)' [hereinafter 'A and C Act' for the sake of convenience and clarity].

2. Mr.S.R.Sundar, learned counsel for petitioner who is before this Court submits that the captioned Arb OP is predicated on a clause in an agreement between the petitioner and respondent which is in the nature of an Insurance Policy and



WEB COPY

it is captioned '*CONTRACTORS ALL RISK INSURANCE POLICY*'. To be noted, this policy shall hereinafter be referred to as '*primary contract*' for the sake of convenience and clarity.

3. Adverting to the petition in captioned Arb OP, more particularly paragraph No.17 thereat, learned counsel submits that the arbitration clause in the primary contract has been extracted and reproduced therein. Paragraph No.17 of petition in captioned Arb OP reads as follows:

'17. The arbitration clause under the terms of the policy is as follows:

If any dispute or difference shall arise as to the quantum to be paid under this Policy (liability being otherwise admitted) such difference shall independently of all other questions be referred to the decision of a sole arbitrator, to be appointed in writing by the parties thereto or, if they cannot agree upon a single arbitrator within 30 days of any party invoking arbitration, the same shall be referred to a panel of three Arbitrators comprising of two Arbitrators - one to be appointed by each of the parties to the dispute/difference, and the third Arbitrator to be appointed by such two Arbitrators and arbitration shall be conducted under and in accordance with the provisions of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act 1996.

It is clearly agreed and understood that no



Arb.O.P.(Com.Div.)No.133 of 2022

dispute or difference shall be referable to arbitration as hereinbefore provided, if the Company has disputed or not accepted liability under or in respect of this Policy.

It is hereby expressly stipulated and declared that it shall be a condition precedent to any right of action or suit upon this Policy that the award by such Arbitrator/Arbitrators or Umpire of the amount of the loss or damage shall be first obtained.'

4. Learned counsel submits that arbitral disputes erupted between the petitioner and respondent resulting in correspondence but there is a deadlock regarding nomination of arbitrator necessitating the presentation of captioned Arb OP in this Court.

5. Prima facie case for issue of notice made out.

6. Issue notice to respondent returnable in four weeks i.e., returnable by 20.04.2022. Private notice permitted.

7. List on 20.04.2022.'

3. The above proceedings shall be read as an integral part and parcel of this order. The short forms, abbreviations and short references used in the aforementioned earlier proceedings shall continue to be used in the instant order also for the sake of convenience and clarity.



WEB COPY

4. Post aforementioned proceedings, notice was issued to lone respondent, lone respondent was duly served and lone respondent Company has entered appearance through a counsel. Thereafter, there were two listings, one on 20.04.2022 and another on 26.04.2022 and the proceedings made by this Section 11 Court on these two listings are as follows:

Proceedings dated 20.04.2022:

'Read this in conjunction with and in continuation of earlier proceedings made in the previous listing on 23.03.2022.

2. Mr.S.R.Sundar, learned counsel for petitioner and Mr.K.Shiva, learned counsel for lone respondent are before this Court.

3. To be noted, the lone respondent has been served and Mr.K.Shiva submits that he along with his co-counsel will be filing vakalatnama by tomorrow. Learned counsel for lone respondent requests for a short accommodation to get instructions and revert to this Court including instructions regarding downsizing the 'Arbitral Tribunal' ['AT'] and making it as AT to be constituted by a sole Arbitrator who shall be appointed by this Court in exercise of powers under Section 11 of 'The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (Act No.26 of 1996)' [hereinafter 'A and C Act' for the sake of convenience and clarity]

4. List on Tuesday i.e., on 26.04.2022.'



WEB COPY

Proceedings dated 26.04.2022:

'Read this in conjunction with and in continuation of earlier proceedings made in the previous listing on 20.04.2022.

2. Mr.S.R.Sundar, learned counsel for petitioner is before this Court. Mr.Adarsh Subramanian, learned counsel with address for service at No.20, Madhumalathi, Seethammal Road, Seethammal Colony, Alwarpet, Chennai – 600 018, who is before this Court submits that he has instructions to file vakalatnama on behalf of the lone respondent along with his co-counsel. Learned counsel requests for a short accommodation to get instructions and file vakalatnama. Request acceded to.

3. List on 29.04.2022.'

5. Today, Mr.S.R.Sundar, learned counsel for sole petitioner and Mr.Adarsh Subramanian, learned counsel for lone respondent are before this Court.

6. Adverting to the aforementioned earlier proceedings dated 20.04.2022, learned counsel for respondent submits that the lone respondent is not inclined to consent for downsizing of the 'Arbitral Tribunal' ['AT' for the sake of brevity]. In other words, learned counsel submits that the lone



Arb.O.P.(Com.Div.)No.133 of 2022

respondent insists that arbitrable disputes that have arisen between the petitioner and respondent should be adjudicated upon by a three member AT as provided for in the arbitration agreement i.e., clause 7 of primary contract. To be noted, clause 7 of primary contract has been extracted and reproduced in paragraph No.17 of captioned Arb OP by petitioner and the same has in turn been extracted and reproduced by this Court in paragraph No.3 of the aforementioned proceedings made in the listing on 23.03.2022. To be noted there is no dispute or contestation about existence of this arbitration agreement as between parties before this Section 11 Court.

7. Learned counsel for respondent also points out that the primary contract has been drafted by the petitioner Insurance Company. It may not be necessary to dilate any further on this as making of an arbitration agreement and constitution of AT more particularly the size of AT are matters that are indisputably in the realm of party Autonomy which is one of the sublime philosophies underlying the A and C Act. In the case on hand, *inter alia* as the primary contract has admittedly been drafted by the petitioner Insurance Company, considering the facts and circumstances of the case including the nature of the arbitrable disputes that have arisen, this Court



deems it appropriate to go by the party Autonomy principle rather than venturing into the exercise of downsizing the AT which is not akin to the legal drill in a Section 11 Court.

8. The above approach is being adopted owing to the limited legal landscape within which a legal drill under Section 11 of A and C Act has to be performed. A legal drill under Section 11 of A and C Act should perambulate within the statutory perimeter sketched by sub-section (6A) thereat, this came up for consideration in oft-quoted **Mayavati Trading** case law i.e., **Mayavati Trading Pvt. Ltd vs Pradyut Deb Burman** reported in **(2019) 8 SCC 714**, relevant paragraph is paragraph No.10 and the same reads as follows:

'10. This being the position, it is clear that the law prior to the 2015 Amendment that has been laid down by this Court, which would have included going into whether accord and satisfaction has taken place, has now been legislatively overruled. This being the position, it is difficult to agree with the reasoning contained in the aforesaid judgments, as Section 11(6-A) is confined to the examination of the existence of an arbitration agreement and is to be understood in the narrow sense as has been laid down in the judgment in Duro Felguera.



SA.'

*(underlining made by this Court to supply
emphasis and highlight)*

9. Aforementioned paragraph No.10 of ***Mayavati Trading*** case law takes this Court to ***Duro Felguera*** principle i.e., ***M/s.Duro Felguera S.A. Vs M/s. Gangavaram Port Limited*** reported in ***2017 (9) SCC 729***, relevant paragraphs in ***Duro Felguera*** case law are paragraph Nos.47, 59 and the same read as follows:

'47. What is the effect of the change introduced by the Arbitration and Conciliation (Amendment) Act, 2015 (hereinafter referred to as "the 2015 Amendment") with particular reference to Section 11(6) and the newly added Section 11(6-A) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (hereinafter referred to as "the 1996 Act") is the crucial question arising for consideration in this case.

.....

59. The scope of the power under Section 11(6) of the 1996 Act was considerably wide in view of the decisions in SBP and Co. and Boghara Polyfab. This position continued till the amendment brought about in 2015. After the amendment, all that the Courts need to see is whether an arbitration agreement exists – nothing more, nothing less. The legislative policy and purpose is essentially to minimize the Courts intervention at the stage of appointing the arbitrator and this intention as incorporated in Section 11(6-A)



Arb.O.P.(Com.Div.)No.133 of 2022

WEB COPY

ought to be respected.'

10. To be noted, the above has been mentioned for the limited purpose of highlighting the limited scope of a legal drill under Section 11 of A and C Act.

11. Be that as it may, reverting to the specific facts qua the case on hand, both learned counsel submit that the deadlock is only with regard to appointment of third Arbitrator. It is also to be noted that the expression used in the Arbitration Agreement is 'Third Arbitrator'. However, this Court chooses to use the expression 'Presiding Arbitrator' for the sake of convenience, clarity and specificity. Both learned counsel submit that the petitioner and respondent have nominated a former Hon'ble High Court Judge as their respective nominees. In this regard, a communication dated 05.11.2021 from the respondent to the petitioner and the petitioner's reply to the same dated 17.01.2022 are relevant.

12. Therefore, without dilating on exchange of correspondence preceding the aforementioned two communications are scanned and



Arb.O.P.(Com.Div.)No.133 of 2022

reproduced infra:

WEB COPY

SUJITH JAISWAL HIGH COURT ADVOCATE advocatesujithjaiswal@gmail.com	75 4G-1, Saraswathi Residency, 3-4-340/1, Barkatpura, Hyderabad - 500 027 Mobile No: 764-999-9999
--	---

REJOINDER NOTICE FOR APPOINTMENT OF ARBITRATOR

To: DATE: 05.11.2021

1. SRI.S.R.SUNDAR & SRI.A.S. SUBRAMANIAN,
Advocates,
Old No.127, New No.261,
11 Floor Angappa Nalakan Street,
Chennai-600001.
Email id: kasthunandsundar@gmail.com

2. M/S. NEW INDIA ASSURANCE COMPANY LIMITED,
Chennai Regional Office-710000,
770-A, "Dewa Towers" III Floor,
Anna Salai, Chennai-600002.

Sir,

Sub: Rejoinder Notice - Proposing name of Hon'ble Sri Justice Chella Kodanda Ram, Retired High Court Judge of Telangana as the Appointed Arbitrator of M/s.Ranchi Expressways Limited for resolution of dispute by way of Arbitration arising out of Contractor's All Risks Insurance Policy No.71070144110300000007 which extended vide CAR Policy No.71070144110300000001 in respect of Ranchi Rargon Jamshedpur Junction from 114 K.M. to 227.5 K.M. of NH33 - Reg.

Ref:

- (1) Contractor's All Risks Insurance Policy(CAR) No.71070144110300000007.
- (2) Extended CAR Policy No.71070144110300000001.
- (3) Final Survey Report Dated 12.06.2018 bearing No.ICAR/P/2018/04 of M/s.Inder Chadha & Associates.
- (4) E-Mail Dated 07.05.2019 from Smt.N.Shyamala, C/o.New India Assurance Company Limited evaluating claim upto Rs.9,89,766/-.
- (5) Legal Notice dated 31.12.2019 issued on behalf of M/s.Ranchi Expressways Limited to M/s.New India Assurance Company Limited.
- (6) Reply Notice dated 10.02.2020 issued from the Desk of Sri S.R.Sundar & A.S.Subramanyan, Advocates on behalf of M/s.New India Assurance Company Limited.



Page 1 of 4



WEB COPY



Arb.O.P.(Com.Div.)No.133 of 2022

SUJITH JAISWAL

HIGH COURT ADVOCATE

advocatesujithjaiswal@gmail.com

#G-1, Saraswathi Residency,
3-4-340/1, Barkatpura,
Hyderabad - 500 027
Mobile No: 764-999-9999

76

UNDER the Instructions of my Client M/s.Ranchi Expressways Limited, Rep. by its Director, having its Office at Madhucon House, 1129/A, Road No.36, Jubilee Hills, Hyderabad, T.S., I hereby issue the following Rejoinder Notice:

1. THAT my Client is the Contractor of Four Lining Roadwork at Ranchi Rargon Jamshedpur Junction from 114 K.M. to 227.5 K.M. of NH33 in the state of Jharkhand.
2. THAT my Client had insured his road contract with No.2 of you under the reference Nos.1 & 2 and paid premiums as demanded. As a part the agreement, my Client had commenced the road works at various locations in total length of 163.5 KMs. My Client had specifically obtained Insurance Policy covering the risks for existing road, proposed roads, service road and all CD structures and for total length of the project.
3. THAT due to heavy rainfall and floods in the month of July-2017 there were damages in the various stretches of 163 Kilometers of road under construction from Ranchi Rargon. The natural calamity resulted in inundation causing heavy damages to the existing road as well as the completed sections of the road.
4. THAT the said damage was immediately informed to No.2 you(Insurer) and my Client had estimated their loss and claimed an amount of Rs.25,27,21,819/- under various heads. The assessment of loss of my Client was examined by you and one surveyor appointed by you for the particular project i.e., M/s.Inder Chadha & Associates. It was informed to my client by its consultant i.e., K.M.Dastur, Re-Insurance Brokers Pvt. Ltd., that the said M/s.Inder Chadha Associates had recommended the settlement of Claim amount for Rs.3,36,35,071/- and



WEB COPY



Arb.O.P.(Com.Div.)No.133 of 2022

SUJITH JAISWAL

HIGH COURT ADVOCATE

advocatesujithjaiswal@gmail.com

#G-1, Saraswathi Residency,
3-4-340/1, Barkatpura,
Hyderabad - 500 027
Mobile No: 764-999-9999

for my Clients utter surprise, No.2 of you have further diminished my Client's insurance settlement amount to Rs.9,89,766/- with erroneous conclusions without following due process.

5. THAT as there was discrepancies in the estimation of losses between the parties, my Client had invoked Arbitration Clause No.7 agreed under Contractor's All Risks Insurance Policy(CAR) No.71070144110300000007 and accordingly vide reference 5th cited above, my Client had proposed three names as Arbitrators awaiting your consent. Further my Client informed you that in the event you do not agree to any of the names in 5th reference then you were pleased to consider the name of Hon'ble Justice Vilas V. Afzulpurkar as our nominee and convey the name of your nominee.

6. THAT vide reference 6th cited above you have informed that you are not willing to consent on our suggested names of Arbitrators to appoint as a Sole Arbitrator and you have nominated Hon'ble Justice Sri K.Kannan, Retired Judge of Punjab & Haryana High Court to appoint him as Sole Arbitrator.

7. THAT my Client is not agreeing for appointment of Hon'ble Justice Sri K.Kannan, Retired Judge of Punjab & Haryana High Court as a Sole Arbitrator. Further my Client has agreed Hon'ble Justice Sri K.Kannan, Retired Judge of Punjab & Haryana High Court as your nominee Arbitrator.

8. THAT due to efflux of time, changed circumstances, pandemic situations and non-availability of Hon'ble Justice Vilas V. Afzulpurkar, we are constrained rescind our earlier proposal mentioned in 5th reference cited i.e., Notice dated 31.12.2019 and propose the name of Hon'ble Sri



WEB COPY



Arb.O.P.(Com.Div.)No.133 of 2022

78

SUJITH JAISWAL

HIGH COURT ADVOCATE

advocatesujithjaiswal@gmail.com


#G-1, Saraswathi Residency,
3-4-340/1, Barkatpura,
Hyderabad - 500 027
Mobile No: 764-999-9999

Justice Challa Kodanda Ram, Retired High Court Judge of Telangana as our Nominee Arbitrator.

9. IN view of aforementioned circumstances, my Client is initiating steps to approach its Appointed Arbitrator Hon'ble Sri Justice Challa Kodanda Ram, Retired High Court Judge of Telangana requesting him to choose Presiding Arbitrator in consultation with your Nominee Arbitrator in terms of Clause No.7 of Contractor's All Risks Insurance Policy No.71070144110300000007. The details of my Client's Nominated Arbitrator are mentioned below:

Hon'ble Sri Justice Challa Kodanda Ram,
Retired High Court Judge of Telangana,
Plot No.68, Road No.71, Jubilee Hills,
Phase-III, Hyderabad-500096.
Mob. No:+91 83310 10695
E-mail ID: ckrj@ckrjoffice.com

You are further requested to share the contact details of your Appointed Arbitrator Hon'ble Justice Sri K.Kannan, Retired Judge of Punjab & Haryana High Court, enabling us to contact his Lordship for further steps.


SUJITH JAISWAL
ADVOCATE





WEB COPY



Arb.O.P.(Com.Div.)No.133 of 2022

S.R. SUNDAR & A. S. Subramanian

Advocates

Old No.127, New No.261, II Floor Angappa Naicken Street, Chennai-600001

Email: kasthuriandsundar@gmail.com

BY RPAD/EMAIL

17th January 2022

To
Mr. Sujith Jaiswal
Advocate
G-1, Saraswathi Residency
3-4-340/1, Barkatpura
Hyderabad 500027
Mobile 76499 99999
advocatessujithjaiswal@gmail.com

Sir,

REPLY TO REJOINDER NOTICE FOR APPOINTMENT OF ARBITRATOR

Sub: Reply to Rejoinder dt. 5.11.2021 with regard to proposal of name of Hon'ble Justice Sri.Chella Kothandaram, (Retd. High Court Judge of Telangana as the appointed Arbitrator of M/s Ranchi Express Ways Ltd. for resolution of dispute by way of arbitration arising out of Contractors All Risk Insurance Policy No. 71070144110300000007 which extended vide CAR Policy No. 71070144110300000001 in respect of Ranchi Bargon, Jamshedpur junction from 114 km to 277.5 km of NH 33 - appointment of Hon'ble Justice K.P.Sivasubramaniam(Retired Judge of High court of Judicature at Madras High Court) on behalf of the Insurer.

Ref: 1) Your legal Notice dt. 31.12.2019 issued on behalf of Ranchi Express Ltd. to New India Assurance Co. Ltd.
2) Reply Notice dt. 10.2.2020 issued on behalf of The New India Assurance Co. Ltd.
3) Rejoinder dt. 05.11.2021 issued on behalf of M/s Ranchi Express Highways.Under instructions from our client M/s The New India Assurance Company Ltd. having its Claims Hub at No.



WEB COPY



Arb.O.P.(Com.Div.)No.133 of 2022

21, Patullos Road, Chennai 600 002 and its Regional Office at No. 770-A, Dewa Towers, 3rd Floor, Anna Salai, Chennai 600 002 we hereby issue the following reply to your rejoinder notice dt. 05.11.2021 issued on behalf of your client M/s Ranchi Express Ways Ltd. represented by its Director having its office at Madhuson House, 1129/A, Road No. 36, Jubilee Hills, Hyderabad TS.

1. At the outset our client denies all the allegations made in your reply notice except that those are specifically admitted herein and put your client to strict proof of the same. Our client further states that nothing in this rejoinder shall be deemed to have been any acceptance on merits of the case on behalf of our client.
2. Your client is put to strict proof of the contents made in para-1 that your client is a contractor of 4 lane road work at Ranchi Rargon, Jamshedpur Junction from 114 Kms. to 277.5 kms. of NH-33 of the state of Jharkhand.
3. With regards to averments in para-2 it is true that your client has insured his road contract with our client. Your client is put to strict proof of the other averments made in para-2.
4. With regards to averments in para-3 it is denied that due to heavy rain falls and floods at the month of July 2017 there were damages in various stretches of 163 kms. of road under construction from Ranchi Rargon. It is further denied that the natural calamity resulted in inundation causing heavy damages to the existing road as well as completed sections of the road.
5. With regards to averments in para-4 it is true that to assess the loss of the alleged claim our client had appointed M/s Inder Chander & Associates and a survey report has been furnished by them. It is relevant to note that in terms of the Insurance Act, the



WEB COPY



Arb.O.P.(Com.Div.)No.133 of 2022

Insurer has every right to go through the survey report and take appropriate assessment of loss based upon the survey report and other materials including the terms of contract and hence it is denied that our client has diminished the insurance settlement amount to Rs. 9,89,766/- which is erroneous against Rs. 3,36,35,071/- as assessed by the surveyors without any valid reasons.

6. With regards to averments in para-5 it is stated that the Insurance Policy covers the risks in terms of the terms and conditions as arrived between your client and our client. Our client states the discrepancy in the assessment of loss by the surveyor has been rectified and my client has arrived at the loss amount correctly and it is denied that a sum of Rs. 25,27,21,819/- was just adequate and reasonable as claimed by your client. It is further denied that our client has wrongly evaluated the claim at Rs. 9,89,766/- based upon the report of the surveyor.
7. With regards to averments in para-6 and 7 they are matters of record.
8. Our client further states that due to efflux of time and changed circumstances pandemic situations and non availability of Hon'ble Justice K.Kannan the Insurer is constrained to rescind the proposal of nomination of Hon'ble Justice K.Kannan as their nominee and proposed Hon'ble Justice K.P.Sivasubramaniam, a retired Judge of Madras High Court as their nominee arbitrator. Our clients have also obtained necessary consent from him also in this regard.



Arb.O.P.(Com.Div.)No.133 of 2022

WEB COPY

9. Our client therefore states that both the nominated arbitrators have to choose the presiding arbitrator to resolve the disputes. The details of Hon'ble Justice K.P.Sivasubramaniam(RT) is as follows :

Hon'ble Justice K P Sivasubramaniam
(Retired Judge of High Court of Judicature at Madras)
New No 47, Old No 46, Pulla Avenue, Shenoy Nagar
Chennai-600030
Phone No 9444701312
Email ID : kpsivam@yahoo.com

Regards

S. R. Sundar

S R Sundar

CC:

Hon'ble Justice K P Sivasubramaniam
(Retired Judge of High Court of Judicature at Madras)
New No 47, Old No 46, Pulla Avenue, Shenoy Nagar
Chennai-600030
Phone No 9444701312
Email ID : kpsivam@yahoo.com

FILED-415/TH 14/02/2022
CL 409 (CAT BUILDING 3.0 FLOOR)
Sent on 14/02/2022 17:05
To : 17-02-2022, 17:05:11
FROM: S. R. Sundar, RT
M12500
Retired Judge
Track on www.mhcnls.com
Tel: 08025666071 New Delhi, Dtr. Sd/-

FILED-415/TH 14/02/2022
CL 409 (CAT BUILDING 3.0 FLOOR)
Sent on 14/02/2022 17:05
To: S. R. Sundar, RT
FROM: S. R. Sundar, RT
M12500
Retired Judge
Track on www.mhcnls.com



Arb.O.P.(Com.Div.)No.133 of 2022

WEB COPY

13. Both learned counsel submit that it will suffice if this Court breaks the deadlock by appointing a Presiding Arbitrator. Therefore, this Court passes the following order:

(a) This Court appoints Hon'ble Mr.Justice N.Paul Vasantha Kumar, (retired Former Chief Justice, High Court of Jammu & Kashmir), No.24-A, 2nd Street, Kamaraj Avenue, Adyar, Chennai-600 020, Mobile No.9444390958, Email Id: justicenpv@gmail.com as Presiding Arbitrator;

(b) The sequitur to the above (in the light of the narrative thus far supra) is a three Member Arbitral Tribunal is now constituted and the same will be constituted by Hon'ble Justice K.P.Sivasubramaniam (retired Judge of High Court of Judicature at Madras), Hon'ble Mr.Justice N.Paul Vasantha Kumar (retired Former Chief Justice, High Court of Jammu & Kashmir) and Hon'ble Mr.Justice Challa Kodanda Ram (retired High Court Judge of Telangana) with Hon'ble Mr.Justice N.Paul Vasantha Kumar (retired Former Chief Justice, High Court of Jammu & Kashmir) as the Presiding Arbitrator;

(c) Hon'ble AT is requested to enter upon reference,



Arb.O.P.(Com.Div.)No.133 of 2022

adjudicate the arbitrable disputes that have arisen between the parties qua primary contract and render an award;

14. Captioned Arb OP is disposed of in the aforesaid manner. There shall be no order as to costs.

29.04.2022

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Index : Yes / No

mk

Note: Registry is directed to communicate a copy of this order forthwith to

1. Hon'ble Mr.Justice N.Paul Vasantha Kumar,
(retired Former Chief Justice, High Court of Jammu & Kashmir),
No.24-A, 2nd Street, Kamaraj Avenue,
Adyar, Chennai-600 020,
Mobile No.9444390958, Email Id: justicenpv@gmail.com.
2. Hon'ble Mr.Justice Challa Kodanda Ram
(Retired High Court Judge of Telangana)
Plot No.68, Road No.71, Jubilee Hills,
Phase-III, Hyderabad - 500 096, Mobile No.:9183310 10695
E-mail ID : ckrj@ckrjoffice.com
3. Hon'ble Justice K.P.Sivasubramaniam
(retired Judge of High Court of Judicature at Madras),
New No.47, Old No.46, Pulla Avenue, Shenoy Nagar
Chennai-600 030
Phone No.9444701312
Email ID : kpsivam@yahoo.com.

M.SUNDAR. J.,

mk



WEB COPY



Arb.O.P.(Com.Div.)No.133 of 2022

Arb.O.P.(Com.Div.)No.133 of 2022

29.04.2022