

FOR HEARING AND FINAL DISPOSAL :

35 CHOL/75/2025) Mr. Khan Fayzan, Advocate for the applicant.
in)
ARBAPL/18836/2022) None present for the respondents.
)
) PC.: The present Chamber Order is taken out by
) the applicant for setting aside Order dated
) 17.10.2023, rejecting captioned Arbitration
) Application under O.S.Rule 986 for non-
) compliance of office objections.
)
) Ld. Advocate for the applicant submits that the
) respondents were served with the Chamber
) Order as per Affidavits of Service, which were
) filed on record. However, despite service,
) none appeared for and on behalf of the
) respondents.
)
) Heard Ld. Advocate for the applicant. Perused
) Affidavit in Support. It is contended that clerk
) of Advocate on record attempted to comply
) some of office objections, however, due to ill-
) health, the clerk could not comply office
) objections and even, not inform Advocate on
) Record about non-compliance of office
) objections. It is further contended that for the
) same reason, delay of 220 days caused in filing
) present Chamber Order, which was
) unintentional. Ld. Advocate for the applicant
) submits the applicant has a good case on
) merits, and he will pursue with captioned
) Petition diligently if it is restored to file.
) Hence, it is prayed that captioned Petition may
) be restored to file by condoning delay.
)
) Contentions raised on oath, by the applicant,
) remain uncontested for want of resistance on
) the part of respondents since the respondents
) choose to remain absent despite service of
) Chamber Order. Hence, in my view, the
) applicant by raising aforesaid contentions in

