
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
IN ITS COMMERCIAL DIVISION**

COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION APPLICATION NO. 189 OF 2024

SHRADDHA
KAMLESH
TALEKAR
Digitally
signed by
SHRADDHA
KAMLESH
TALEKAR
Date:
2025.07.10
14:19:58
+0530

Goldmines Telefilms Private Ltd.	... Applicant
Vs.	
Sree Venkateswara Cinemas LLP	.. Respondent(s)

Mr. Aurup Dasgupta *a/w. Ms. Drshika Hemnani and Ms. Prapti Bhadra
i/b Jhangiani, Narula Associates, for Applicant.*
Ms. Yashita Bhardwaj *i/b MZM Legal LLP, for Respondent.*

CORAM : SOMASEKHAR SUNDARESAN, J.

Date : July 8, 2025

Order :

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 an agreement dated April 27, 2021 [***“Agreement”***]. The arbitration agreement is contained in Clause 46 (found at Page [51] 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. It is apparent from the record that the arbitration agreement was invoked by the Applicant on July 16, 2024. It is seen from the record that the affidavit in reply filed on behalf of the Respondent does not question the existence of the arbitration agreement. The said reply is entirely on merits of the dispute and as to how no dispute that would fall within the ambit of arbitration has arisen.

3. Learned Counsel for the Respondent submits that the invocation notice indicates that payment ought to be made in 10 days, upon which a dispute would arise. Consequently, it was submitted, the invocation notice did not yet demonstrate the dispute between the parties. However, it is conceded fairly that no payment had been made within 10 days of the invocation notice or thereafter. Consequently, even this contention could not warrant holding up this Application any further.

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

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

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 to arbitration by a Sole Arbitrator.

6. Consequently, leaving all contentions on merits including whether the invocation has been effectively made, the Application is *finally disposed of* in the following terms :

A) Mr. Chirag Mody, an 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. The contact details of the Arbitrator are as under :

Office No. 21, 6th Floor, 5 Surya Mahal,
Burjorji Bharucha Marg, Fort, Mumbai –
400 001.
Email id – chiragm1973@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 of upload of this order. 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 parties within a period of two weeks from receipt of a copy of this Order;

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.]