



\$~S2

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

+ **ARB.P. 320/2025**

NKG INFRASTRUCTURE LIMITED

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Risha Mittal, Mr. Rohan Narula,
Mr. Sanchit Gupta and Md. Adil
Alam, Advocates.

versus

**UNION OF INDIA THROUGH DIRECTOR GENERAL,
MARRIED ACCOMODATION PROJECT & ANR.**

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Monika Arora, CGSC with Mr
Subhrodeep Saha and Mr Prabhat
Kumar, Advs.
Ms. Archana Kumari, GP

**CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD**

ORDER
16.05.2025

%

I.A. 12562/2025

1. The present Application has been filed by the Union of India for correction/modification of clerical errors in the Order dated 18.03.2025.
2. It is stated in the Application that in paragraph No.6 and 7 of the Order dated 18.03.2025, some inadvertent typographical errors have occurred inasmuch as at Para 6, the submissions made by the learned Counsel for the Petitioner have been reflected as the submissions made by the learned Counsel for the Respondents and at Para 7, the submissions made by the learned Counsel for the Respondents have been reflected as the



submissions made by the learned Counsel for the Petitioner.

3. In view of the above, paragraph No.6 & 7 of the Order dated 18.03.2025 are corrected to the extent that in paragraph No.6 “learned Counsel for the Respondent” be read as “learned Counsel for the Petitioner” and in paragraph No.7 “learned Counsel for the Petitioner” be read as “learned Counsel for the Respondent”. The corrected paragraphs No.6 & 7 reads as under:

“6. The learned Counsel for the Petitioner has appeared on advance notice. It is stated by the learned Counsel for the Respondent that as per the terms of the Agreement, only an Engineer can be appointed as an Arbitrator to adjudicate on the disputes between the parties.

7. Per contra, learned Counsel for the Respondent states that a substantial amount of money is due and payable and considering the nature of the contract a retired Judge of this Court should be appointed as an Arbitrator to adjudicate on the disputes between the parties.”

4. Order dated 18.03.2025 stands corrected accordingly.

5. The application is disposed of.

6. Let this Order be read conjointly with the Order dated 18.03.2025. As and when a request for certified copy of the Order dated 18.03.2025 is received, let a certified copy of this Order be given along with the certified copy of order dated 18.03.2025.

SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD, J

MAY 16, 2025/Rahul