



ARB-441-2025

-1-

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

111

ARB-441-2025

Date of Decision: 04.08.2025

Deepak Duggal

...Applicant

Versus

Rajeshwar Iyer and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: - Mr. Shivam Grover, Advocate for the applicant

Mr. Pranjal P. Chaudhary, Advocate for the respondents

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. Through instant joint application under Section 29A (4) & (5) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (for short '**1996 Act**'), the parties are seeking extension of mandate of Arbitrator.

2. The applicant preferred an application under Section 11(6) of 1996 Act seeking appointment of an Arbitrator. By order dated 18.10.2019 of this Court, a Sole Arbitrator was appointed to adjudicate the dispute between the parties. Vide order 28.05.2024 of this Court, the Arbitrator was substituted. By his letter dated 08.07.2024, the newly appointed Arbitrator expressed his inability to furnish declaration under Section 12 of 1996 Act. Thereafter, vide order dated 29.07.2024, Mr. Justice Rajan Gupta, Former Judge of this Court was appointed as Arbitrator to adjudicate the disputes between the parties.

**ARB-441-2025****-2-**

3. Both the parties appeared before the Arbitrator and filed their claims/counter claims. The mandate of Arbitrator in terms of Section 29A of 1996 Act has expired.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that Arbitrator was appointed by this Court, thus, this Court can extend mandate of Arbitrator. Both the parties have filed claims/counter claims. The matter has already been heard.

5. Learned counsel for the respondent does not dispute the afore-stated factual/legal position and prayer of the applicant.

6. In the wake of statement of both sides, the present application is allowed and the mandate of Arbitrator is extended for a period of 3 months from today.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

04.08.2025*Mohit Kumar*

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