



\$~O-71

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **ARB.P. 150/2025**

**DR MAHESH Y REDDY** .....Petitioner

Through: **Mr. Ritesh Khatri, Adv.**

versus

**KEVIN MARCUS WILLIAM GOVINDER**

**SINGH OLAUSSON** .....Respondent

Through: **Mr. Tamra Dhwaj Sharma, Adv.**

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV**

**ORDER**

% **09.12.2025**

**I.A. 30758/2025 (DELAY OF 48 DAYS IN FILING RECALL/REVIEW PETITION)**

1. For the reasons stated in the application, the delay of 48 days in filing the review petition stands condoned.
2. The application stands disposed of.

**REVIEW PET. 614/2025 (REVIEW OF ORDER DT. 18.09.2025)**

3. By way of the present review petition, the petitioner seeks recall/review of order dated 18.09.2025 *vide* which the Court had appointed the Arbitrator.
4. The petitioner during the arbitration proceedings has come to know that the dispute qualifies as an international commercial arbitration under Section 2(f)(i) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, as the



respondent is a resident of Sweden.

5. Neither was the aforesaid fact pointed out by the petitioner when the order dated 18.09.2025 came to be passed, nor any objection was raised by the respondent.

6. Nevertheless, the arbitrator will have to be appointed keeping in view the aforesaid aspect as the dispute is of international commercial arbitration.

7. Under these circumstances, the order dated 18.09.025 deserves to be recalled.

8. The review petition stands allowed and disposed of.

**ARB.P. 150/2025**

9. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner seeks liberty to withdraw the instant petition with liberty to take appropriate recourse in accordance with law.

10. Liberty, as prayed, is granted. The petition stands disposed of as withdrawn.

**PURUSHAINdra KUMAR KAURAV, J**

**DECEMBER 9, 2025**

aks/amg