
IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
ARBITRATION PETITION NO. 68 OF 2025

Poonawalla Fincorp Limited

...Petitioner

Versus

Hero Electric Vehicles Private Limited & Anr

...Respondents

Mr. Ahan Gadkari, a/w Vikas Mishra, Mohit Gadkari, i/b Mohit Gadkari & Co., for the Petitioner.

None for Respondents.

CORAM : SOMASEKHAR SUNDARESAN, J.

DATE : JUNE 16, 2025

ORDER :

1. Liberty to file service affidavit with the Registry. The same is taken on record.

2. This Petition has been filed under Section 11 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (***“the Act”***), seeking appointment of an arbitrator in connection with disputes and differences that are said to have arisen between the parties under Buyer Agreement dated September 5, 2022 and Facility Agreement dated 30th January, 2023 (collectively ***“Agreements”***). The arbitration agreement is contained in Clauses 16 and 34 (found at Pages 56 and 94 of the Petition). In the

interest of brevity, the arbitration agreement is not being extracted here. Suffice it to say, that this matter falls within the jurisdiction of this Court.

3. It is apparent from the record that the arbitration agreement was invoked by the Petitioner on May 10, 2024. There is no reply filed to the said invocation.

4. The scope of review under Section 11 is explicitly set out in Section 11(6A) of the Act. It is now trite law, with particular regard to the decisions of a seven-judge bench in the *Interplay Judgement*¹ followed by multiple others, including *SBI General*² and *Patel*³ that the Section 11 Court ought not to venture beyond examining the existence of a validly existing arbitration agreement that has been formally executed. Even questions of existential substance is a matter that falls squarely in the domain of the arbitral tribunal, in view of Section 16 of the Act.

5. Being satisfied that an arbitration agreement is validly in existence, and that arbitration has been duly invoked, it is in the fitness of things to refer the disputes and differences between the parties in

¹ *In Re: Interplay Between Arbitration Agreement under Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 and Stamp Act, 1899* (2024) 6 SCC 1

² *SBI General Insurance Co. Ltd. Vs. Krish Spinning*, 2024 SCC OnLine 1974

³ *Ajay Madhusudan Patel Vs. Jyotindra S. Patel*, 2024 SCC OnLine, 2597

connection with the aforesaid agreements to arbitration by a Sole Arbitrator.

6. In these circumstances, this Petition is hereby ***finally disposed of***, in terms of the following order:

- A) The disputes and differences covered by this Petition is hereby referred to the Indian Law Society's Centre for Arbitration and Mediation, Pune (<https://ilsca.co.in>), in terms of its Institutional Arbitration Rules, to appoint an appropriate arbitrator to adjudicate upon the disputes and differences between the parties arising out of and in connection with the Agreement referred to above;
- B) A copy of this Order will be communicated to the Indian Law Society's Centre for Arbitration and Mediation, Pune by the Advocates for the Petitioner from the date on which this order is uploaded on the website of this Court. The Petitioner shall provide the contact and communication particulars of the parties to the Centre along with a copy of this Order;
- C) The Learned Sole Arbitrator is requested to forward the statutory Statement of Disclosure under Section 11(8) read with Section 12(1) of the Act to the Advocates for the Petitioner so as to enable them to

file the same in the Registry of this Court. The Registry of this Court shall retain the said Statement on the file of this Petitioner and a copy of the same shall be furnished by the Advocates for the Petitioner to the Respondent;

D) The parties shall appear before the Learned Sole Arbitrator on such date and at such place as indicated, to obtain appropriate directions with regard to conduct of the arbitration including fixing a schedule for pleadings, examination of witnesses, if any, schedule of hearings etc. At such meeting, the parties shall provide a valid and functional email address along with mobile and landline numbers of the respective Advocates of the parties to the Arbitral Tribunal. Communications to such email addresses shall constitute valid service of correspondence in connection with the arbitration;

E) All arbitral costs and fees of the Arbitral Tribunal shall be borne by the parties equally in the first instance, and shall be subject to any final Award that may be passed by the Tribunal in relation to costs.

7. Needless to say, nothing contained in this order is an expression of an opinion on merits of the matter or the relative strength

of the parties. All issues on merits are expressly kept open to be agitated before the arbitral tribunal appointed hereby.

8. All actions required to be taken pursuant to this order shall be taken upon receipt of a downloaded copy as available on this Court's website.

[SOMASEKHAR SUNDARESAN, J.]