

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
ORIGINAL SIDE

AP/37/2025

LAUREL INVESTMENTS LIMITED
VERSUS
RAJ KUMAR SINGH & ORS.

BEFORE :

The Hon'ble JUSTICE SHAMPA SARKAR

Date: 19th March, 2025.

Appearance:

Mr. Rachit Lakhmani, Adv.

Mr. Shubham Gupta, Adv.

Mr. Rajiv Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Piyush Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Rajsekhar Bal Bakshi, Adv.

. . for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurabh Guhathakurata, Adv.

Mr. Abhratanu Sarkar, Adv.

. . . for the respondents.

1. This is an application for extension of the mandate of the learned Arbitrator.
2. The mandate of the learned Arbitrator expired on January 6, 2025. Parties submit that the matter is at the stage of cross-examination of the respondents' witness.
3. Mr. Guhathakurata, learned Advocate for the respondents has raised serious objection with regard to the manner in which the petitioner has conducted the proceedings. The petitioner is the claimant. According to the respondents, the petitioner had been

seeking unnecessary adjournments. The proceedings had come to a stand still. The counter-claim of the respondent is not being heard and decided. The respondent alleges that the claimant had not been paying the fees. It is further submitted that the learned Advocate who is appearing before the learned Arbitrator, had not been authorized to appear on behalf of the claimant.

4. This Court is not required to decide the issue of competence of the learned Advocates who are appearing before the learned Arbitrator. Such issue can be raised before the learned Arbitrator and can be decided, accordingly.
5. The issue of non-payment of fees to the learned Arbitrator can also be decided by the learned Arbitrator and appropriate orders can be passed.
6. With regard to the unnecessary delay, allegedly caused by the claimant by seeking adjournments, the respondents have the option of making appropriate prayer before the learned Arbitrator and the learned Arbitrator can pass necessary orders in the proceedings and also continue to decide the counter-claim.
7. All the issues raised by Mr. Guhathakurata can be competently dealt with by the learned Arbitrator, if raised before the learned Arbitrator.

8. Mr. Lakhmani, learned Advocate for the petitioner has refuted all the allegations made by the respondents.
9. I find that the matter is at a very matured stage and not granting extension, would cause prejudice and hardship to both the parties. The arbitration proceeding is required to be reached to its logical conclusion.
10. This Court restricts this order to the prayer for extension of the mandate of the learned Arbitrator, and nothing beyond.
11. Accordingly, the mandate of the learned Arbitrator is extended by a further period of eight months from the date of communication of this order, to enable the learned Arbitrator to make and publish his award.
12. AP/37/2025 is, accordingly, disposed of.
13. This Court has not made any observation on the merits of the allegations and counter-allegations.

(SHAMPA SARKAR, J.)