



\$~9

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

+ **TR.P.(C.) 173/2024**

RAJ KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Deepak Yadav, Mr.Vikrant and
Mr. Shubham Yadav, Advocates.

versus

EQUITAS SMALL FINANCE

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Gurmukh Singh Arora, Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

23.10.2024

%

1. Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.
2. The facts of the case would indicate that between the same parties, there were seven agreements. In a dispute pertaining to these seven agreements, the concerned Arbitrator has passed seven awards. The parties, therefore, have filed seven petitions under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, before the Central District, Tis Hazari Court, New Delhi.
3. As seen from the table extracted in paragraph no.2 of the instant petition, proceedings under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 are pending before different Presiding Officers. The said table is reproduced as under:-

S.NO	CASE	TITLE	JUDGE	NDOH
------	------	-------	-------	------



	NO.			
1.	OMP (COMM) 52/24	RAJ KUMAR VS EQUITAS SMALL FINANCE	SH. SANJEEV KUMAR AGGARWAL	07.10.2024
2.	OMP (COMM) 66/24	RAJ KUMAR VS EQUITAS SMALL FINANCE	SH. MANOJ KUMAR NAGPAL	15.10.2024
3.	OMP (COMM) 67/24	RAJ KUMAR VS EQUITAS SMALL FINANCE	SH. MANOJ KUMAR NAGPAL	15.10.2024
4.	OMP (COMM) 69/24	RAJ KUMAR VS EQUITAS SMALL FINANCE	SH. SANJEEV KUMAR AGGARWAL	21.10.2024
5.	OMP (COMM) 70/24	RAJ KUMAR VS EQUITAS SMALL FINANCE	SH. SANJAY SHARMA-II AGGARWAL	14.10.2024
6.	OMP (COMM) 71/24	RAJ KUMAR VS EQUITAS SMALL FINANCE	SH. ANIL KUMAR SISODIA	01.10.2024
7.	OMP (COMM) 72/24	RAJ KUMAR VS EQUITAS SMALL FINANCE	SH. ANIL KUMAR SISODIA	01.10.2024

4. This Court, in the case of ***Gammon India Ltd v. National Highways Authority***¹, while dealing with a similar aspect of arbitrations at the stage of Tribunals, has observed that multiple arbitrations before different Arbitral Tribunals in respect of the same or similar set of contracts is bound to lead to enormous confusion and the same would set the entire arbitration process at naught. The relevant portion of the said decision reads as under:-

“28. Multiple arbitrations before different Arbitral Tribunals in respect

¹ 2020 SCC OnLine Del 659



of the same contract is bound to lead to enormous confusion. The constitution of multiple Tribunals in respect of the same contract would set the entire arbitration process at naught, as the purpose of arbitration being speedy resolution of disputes, constitution of multiple tribunals is inherently counter-productive.

30. Multiple arbitrations can be of various categories:

(i) Arbitrations and proceedings between the same parties under the same contract.

(ii) Arbitrations and proceedings between the same parties arising from a set of contracts constituting one series, which bind them in a single legal relationship.

(iii) Arbitrations and proceedings arising out of identical or similar contracts between one set of entities, wherein the other entity is common.”

5. It is thus seen that the interest of justice would be better served if all the proceedings are heard by one Presiding Officer. On one hand, it would eliminate the possibility of conflicting decisions, and on the other hand, it would also ensure in convenience of the parties.

6. The Court, therefore, directs the District Judge, Central, Tis Hazari Court, New Delhi, to mark all the seven petitions to one Presiding Officer.

7. With the aforesaid directions, the instant petition stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J

OCTOBER 23, 2024

Nc/sp