

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION APPLICATION NO.84 OF 2025

Tata Motors Finance Limited	Applicant
Versus	
M M K Logistics	Respondent

Mr. Smit Solanki *i/b. I.V. Merchant & Co., Advocate for Applicant*

CORAM: SOMASEKHAR SUNDARESAN, J.

DATE : APRIL 15, 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 the Agreement dated June 16, 2020. The arbitration agreement is contained in Clause 21 (found at Page 51 of this Application). In the interest of brevity, the same is not reproduced here. Suffice it to say that the matter falls within the jurisdiction of this Court.

2. Service affidavit dated April 9, 2025 tendered by the Learned Counsel for the Applicant is taken on record. It is evident that service has been effected, but none appears for the Respondent. Consequently,

no useful purpose would be served in keeping this Application pending any further in the docket of this Court.

3. 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.

4. 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 June 16, 2020 to arbitration by a Sole Arbitrator.

5. In these circumstances, this Application is hereby ***finally disposed of***, in terms of the following order:-

¹ *In Re: Interplay Between Arbitration Agreements Under Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 & Stamp Act, 1899 – (2024) 6 SCC 1*

² *SBI General Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Krish Spinning – 2024 SCC OnLine SC 1754*

³ *Ajay Madhusudan Patel v. Jyotrindra S. Patel – 2024 SCC OnLine SC 2597*

A] The disputes and differences covered by this Application is hereby referred to the Mumbai Centre for International Arbitration (<https://mcia.org.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 Mumbai Centre for International Arbitration 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 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 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 and;

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.

6. 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.

7. 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.]