

PURTI
PRASAD
PARAB
Digitally signed by
PURTI PRASAD
PARAB
Date: 2025.03.25
19:25:53 +0530

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
ARBITRATION APPLICATION NO. 13 OF 2024

Goverdhangiri Co-operative Housing Society
Ltd.

...Applicant

Versus

Bharat Infrastructure and Engineering Limited
and Anr.

...Respondents

Mr. Vikramjit Singh Garewal *a/w Ms. Meghna Mehta i/b M/s. Shah & Sanghavi for the Applicant.*

Mr. Dipesh Siroya *a/w Mr. Arijeet Bose for Respondent No.1.*

CORAM : SOMASEKHAR SUNDARESAN, J.

DATE : MARCH 3, 2025

PC :

1. This Application 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 a Development Agreement dated December 19, 2012 (***“Agreement”***). The arbitration agreement is contained in Clause 75 (found at Page 119 of the Application). 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.

2. Today, when the matter is called out, the primary objection on the part of Respondent No.1 is that his role came to an end when the Applicant entered into Consent Terms with Respondent No.2. Consequently, he would submit that there is no contractual obligation between him and the Applicant. He also submits that invocation notice is replicated. The allegations are about Respondent No.2 in connection with Consent Terms and there is nothing stated against him. In these circumstances, according to him this Court ought not to allow this

Application by referring parties to arbitration.

3. Having considered the objection raised by Learned Counsel on behalf of Respondent No.1, it is apparent that each of these facets relates to the merits of the matter. The scope of jurisdiction of this Court is confined to examining the existence of a formally executed arbitration agreement and all other existential questions are for the Arbitral Tribunal to decide.

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 Supreme Court's decision rendered by 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 connection with the aforesaid Agreement dated December 19, 2012 to arbitration by a Sole Arbitrator.

6. Consequently, this Application is *finally disposed of* in the following terms:-

A] Mr. Ranjeev Carvalho, Advocate of this Court is hereby appointed as the Sole Arbitrator to adjudicate upon the disputes and differences between the parties arising out of and in connection with the Agreement referred to above;

¹ In Re: Interplay Between Arbitration Agreements under the 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 SC 1754

³ Ajay Madhusudan Patel Vs. Jyotindra S. Patel - 2024 SCC OnLine SC 2597

Address : 501, 502, Shanti Building, Banaji Street, Fort,
Mumbai – 400 001.

Email ID: ranjeev.carvalho@gmail.com

B] A copy of this Order will be communicated to the Learned Sole Arbitrator by the Advocates for the Applicant within a period of one week from the date on which this order is uploaded on the website of this Court. The Applicant shall provide the contact and communication particulars of the parties to the Arbitral Tribunal 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 Applicant 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 Application and a copy of the same shall be furnished by the Advocates for the Applicant to the Respondents;

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.]