

MJ Jadhav

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION PETITION NO.299 OF 2023
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 4686 OF 2025
IN**

Veenadevi Singhania and Anr. ... Petitioners/Applicants

Vs.

Raymond Limited and Anr. ... Respondents

**COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION PETITION NO.300 OF 2023
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 4685 OF 2025
IN**

COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION PETITION NO.300 OF 2023

Akshaypat Singhania ... Petitioner/Applicant

Vs.

Raymond Limited and Anr. ... Respondents

Mr. Darius Khambata a/w Aditya Mehta a/w Vidhi Shah a/w Rohan Dakshini a/w Namrata Shah a/w Supriya Lopes a/w Jai Sanyal a/w Nimit Bhimjiyani i/b M/s. Rashmikant and Partners for the Applicant (Original Petitioner).

Mr. Janak Dwarkadas, Senior Advocate a/w Chirag Inamdar a/w Suraj Juneja i/b Wadia Ghandy & Co. for the Respondent No.1 in IA/4686/2025 in ARBP/299/2023.

Mr. Gaurav Joshi, Senior Advocate a/w Chirag Kamdar a/w Suraj Juneja i/b Wadia Ghandy & Co. for Respondent No.1 in IA/4685/2025 in ARBP/300/2023.

CORAM : GAURI GODSE, J.

DATED : 21st NOVEMBER 2025

ORDER:

INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 4686 OF 2025 AND
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 4685 OF 2025

1. These applications are filed seeking leave to amend the arbitration petition filed under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996. The petitions are yet to be heard for admission and are at a preliminary stage.

2. According to the learned senior counsel for the petitioners, the proposed amendments are in addition to the grounds which are already raised and no new grounds are raised. Hence, amendments can be allowed.

3. Learned senior counsel appearing for the respondents vehemently opposes the proposed amendments on the ground that not only new grounds are sought to be added but even, the prayer made in the petition is sought to be modified and a new prayer is sought to be added. Hence, according to him, the grounds raised and the prayer by way of the proposed amendments would be barred by limitation. Hence, no purpose would be served by permitting amendment.

4. I have perused the main petitions and the proposed amendments. For considering whether the proposed amendments in the form of additional grounds and the prayer can be permitted, it would be necessary to examine the main petition on merits. Hence, in my view by keeping all the objections open including the objection whether the proposed amendments would be barred by limitation, the same can be allowed.

5. It is clarified that the objections regarding whether the proposed amendments would mean addition of new grounds and new prayer and whether they would be barred in view of the proviso to sub-section (3) of Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act 1996, would be decided at the time of hearing the petition on merits. It is further clarified that if the proposed amendments are found to be barred or otherwise found impermissible in law to be added by way of amendment, the same can be discarded when the petition is heard and decided on merits. Granting permission to carry out amendment would not mean that the proposed amendments are accepted on merits.

6. Hence, by keeping all the objections raised in the reply to the amendment applications open, the Applications are allowed in terms of prayer clause (a).

7. Amendment to be carried out within three weeks.
8. The reply, if any, shall be filed within three weeks from the service of the amended petitions.
9. Interim Applications are allowed in the aforesaid terms.

**COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION PETITION NO. 299 OF 2023 AND
COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION PETITION NO.300 OF 2023**

10. Both the parties agree that the petitions can be decided finally at admission stage.
11. List the petitions for final disposal at admission stage on 16th January 2026.
12. To be listed under the caption for final disposal at admission stage.

(GAURI GODSE, J.)