



\$~74

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CM(M) 3492/2024 & CM APPL. 56936-56937/2024**
SHAILENDRA PAULPetitioner

Through: Mr. Ashish Dholakia, Sr. Advocate
with Mr. Pranshu Paul, Mr. Dhruv
Madan, Ms. Ananya Narain Tyagi and
Mr. Pulkit Gupta, Advocates.

versus

SHARAD BHANSALI & ORS.Respondents
Through: Mr. Vinay Kumar Garg, Sr. Advocate
with Mr. Anshumaan Sahni, Mr. K.S.
Rekhi and Mr. Parv Garg, Advocates
for respondent Nos.1 and 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

% **ORDER**
27.09.2024

1. Both the parties are already before learned Sole Arbitrator.
2. Present petition has been filed by the non-claimant while feeling aggrieved by an order dated 17.09.2024 whereby one agreement has been exhibited with a direction that it be read along with stamp duty which, too, has been exhibited.
3. Learned counsel for the respondents also appears on advance notice.
4. After hearing arguments for some time, learned senior counsel for the petitioner, on instructions, submits that the petitioner may be permitted to withdraw the present petition with liberty to agitate the same issue with respect to the exhibition of the documents and the



stamping thereof before learned Sole Arbitrator at the stage of final arguments.

5. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of as not pressed. Liberty is also granted to the petitioner to address arguments in view of the above statement.

6. It is expected that when learned Sole Arbitrator considers the above said aspect at the final arguments stage, it be done without getting influenced by its own observations contained in the impugned order.

7. It is, however, clarified that this Court has not expressed any opinion whatsoever in context of the above said exhibition of document and stamping.

MANOJ JAIN, J

SEPTEMBER 27, 2024
st