



\$~2 & 3

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

+ ARB.P. 341/2024

AIRPORTS AUTHORITY OF INDIA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Paritosh Anil, Ms. Sukanya Lal
and Mr. Anmol A., Advocates.

versus

BHADRA INTERNATIONAL (INDIA) PVT. LTD & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Ashish Mohan, Mr. Akshit Mago
and Mr. Digvijay Singh, Advocates.

3

+ ARB.P. 342/2024

AIRPORTS AUTHORITY OF INDIA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Paritosh Anil, Ms. Sukanya Lal
and Mr. Anmol A., Advocates.

versus

BHADRA INTERNATIONAL (INDIA) PVT. LTD & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Ashish Mohan, Mr. Akshit Mago
and Mr. Digvijay Singh, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

ORDER

23.04.2024

%

1. The above two petitions under Section 11 of the Arbitration & Conciliation Act, 1996 have been filed on behalf of the petitioner for appointment of the Sole Arbitrator to resolve the disputes inter-se the parties.



2. It is submitted that the learned Arbitrator who had been earlier appointed in these matters held the last meeting on 13.07.2023. His mandate has expired and, therefore, new Arbitrator may be appointed for adjudication of the disputes between the parties.

3. Learned counsel on behalf of the respondent submits that the learned Sole Arbitrator had already been appointed and his mandate has expired. Therefore, instead of appointing the Sole Arbitrator afresh, the mandate of the learned Arbitrator may be extended.

4. **Submissions heard.**

5. Considering that there is no averment made against the learned Sole Arbitrator and the sole ground is that the mandate has expired, this Court observes that no fresh appointment of Sole Arbitrator is warranted in the circumstances. In the connected matters, the extension has already been granted under Section 29-A of the Arbitration & Conciliation Act, to the learned Arbitrator, making these applications infructuous.

6. The two petitions are, therefore, dismissed as infructuous.

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J

APRIL 23, 2024/va