



The matter has been coming up before this Court at least on three earlier occasions.

2.This Arbitration Original Petition has been filed taking advantage of Section 11 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 seeking appointment of an arbitrator to enter into a discussion on the disputes between the petitioner and the respondents.

3.It is stated that the disputes are arbitral in nature and the scheme of the petitioner also provide that, if there is a dispute, it should be referred to arbitration. Notice had been directed to the respondent and notice had been served. But unfortunately, the respondent had taken a conscious decision not to appear before this Court or to engage service of an Advocate to represent him.

4.It was stated by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the seat of arbitration would be in Coimbatore and therefore, any counsel at Coimbatore could be appointed as an arbitrator.



WEB COPY



C.V.KARTHIKEYAN,J.

smv

5.The Court, to verify the bonafide called upon the petitioner themselves, to provide at least two names of Advocates who are practising in Coimbatore, and accordingly, a memo had been filed.

6.Ms.L.Janaki, Advocate, Enrolment No.405 of 2009, Mobile No : 9788357624, who is not stated in the memo is appointed as an arbitrator, to examine the issues between the parties. The arbitrator may issue notice to both the petitioner and the respondent, enter reference and proceed further in manner known to law. The arbitrator may also determine the fees to be paid for the arbitration process.

7.No further orders to be passed. The Arbitration Original Petition stands closed.

29.09.2022

smv

Arb.O.P.No.17 of 2022