



\$~26

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

+ **O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 213/2022**

FINCAP FINANCIAL CORPORATION LTD.Petitioner
Through: **Ms. Rashi Bansal and Ms. Kriti Dang, Advocates.**

versus

M/S R.V. ENTERPRISES AND ORS.Respondents
Through: **Mr. Rajeev Sharma, Advocate for R-5.**

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER
26.07.2024

%

1. By way of this petition under Section 29A of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 [“the Act”], the petitioner seeks extension of the mandate of the learned Arbitrator, who is in *seisin* of disputes between the parties under an Agreement dated 30.01.2018. The learned Arbitrator was appointed by an order of this Court dated 01.02.2019 in ARB.P. 796/2018.
2. There are six respondents, the first being a partnership firm, and respondent Nos.2 to 5, being its partners. Respondent No.6 is also a party to the arbitral proceedings.
3. By order dated 18.01.2023, it was recorded that respondent No.1 need not be served separately, as its partners are already impleaded. The submission of respondent No.5 was also recorded, that he is no longer a



partner in the firm, but that he does not oppose the present petition. By the same order, respondent Nos.3 and 4 were deemed to have been served. By an order dated 06.05.2024, respondent No.2 and 6 were also deemed to have been served.

4. In these circumstances, respondent No.5 has expressed his no objection to the relief sought. Respondent Nos. 2, 3, 4 and 6 have been served, but have chosen not to oppose the petition. All the partners of respondent No.1 have, thus, been served with notice, and have not opposed the petition.

5. For the aforesaid reasons, the petition is allowed, and the mandate of the learned Arbitrator is extended by a period of six months, w.e.f. 26.07.2024.

6. The petition is disposed of.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

JULY 26, 2024
SS/