



ARB-333-2024

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

260

ARB-333-2024

Date of Decision: 15.07.2025

M/s Om Ma Gaytri Enterprises

...Petitioner

Versus

M/s Prisha JMD Pvt. Ltd. and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL


Present: - None for the applicant

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. Through instant application under Section 11(6) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (for short '1996 Act'), the applicant is seeking appointment of an Arbitrator.

2. There was no representation on behalf of the applicant on 13.01.2025 and in the interest of justice, the matter was adjourned for 26.03.2025. On the said date, learned counsel for the applicant again sought permission to serve the respondent through *dasti* process. The applicant, at the first instance, was permitted to serve the respondent by *dasti* process vide order dated 25.07.2024.

3. As per office report, nobody turned up to collect *dasti* notice and even today, there is no representation on behalf of the applicant. It appears that the applicant has lost its interest to pursue the present application.



- 4. Dismissed for non-prosecution.
- 5. Since, there is no representation on behalf of the applicant, it is at liberty to move an appropriate application within three months, if cause survives.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

15.07.2025
Mohit Kumar

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No