



\$~63, 64, 65

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

+ O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 169/2025

M/S MANRAJ ENTERPRISES .....Petitioner

Through: Mr Vivekanand, Advocate

versus

UNION OF INDIA .....Respondent

Through: Mr. Balendu Shekhar, CGSC with  
Mr.Ravi Gopal, Mr. Rajkumar  
Maurya, Mr. Krishna Chaitanya, Ms.  
Tanisha Samanta, Advocates

+ O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 170/2025

M/S MANRAJ ENTERPRISES .....Petitioner

Through: Mr Vivekanand, Advocate

versus

UNION OF INDIA .....Respondent

Through: Mr. Balendu Shekhar, CGSC with  
Mr.Ravi Gopal, Mr. Rajkumar  
Maurya, Mr. Krishna Chaitanya, Ms.  
Tanisha Samanta, Advocates

+ O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 171/2025

M/S MANRAJ ENTERPRISES .....Petitioner

Through: Mr Vivekanand, Advocate

versus

UNION OF INDIA .....Respondent

Through: Mr. Balendu Shekhar, CGSC with  
Mr.Ravi Gopal, Mr. Rajkumar



Maurya, Mr. Krishna Chaitanya, Ms.  
Tanisha Samanta, Advocates

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

**ORDER**

% **24.02.2025**

**I.A. 4786/2025 (Exemption) in O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 169/2025**

**I.A. 4827/2025 (Exemption) in O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 170/2025**

**I.A. 4833/2025 (Exemption) in O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 171/2025**

Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

**O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 169/2025**

**O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 170/2025**

**O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 171/2025**

1. These Petitions under Section 29A(4) and 29A(5) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, read with Section 7 of the Commercial Courts Act, 2015, have been filed by the Petitioner for extending the mandate of the sole Arbitrator in the Arbitration proceedings which are going on between the parties.
2. Material on record indicates that this Court *vide* Order dated 06.02.2023 in ARB. P. 1325/2022, 1326/2022, 1327/2022 appointed a Sole Arbitrator to adjudicate upon the disputes between the parties. It is stated that the mandate of the learned Arbitrator was extended mutually by six months, i.e. till 02.03.2025. It is stated by the learned Counsel for the Petitioner that the matter is at the stage of arguments by the Respondent and, therefore, the mandate of the Arbitrator be extended for a period of 12 months so that award can be pronounced.
3. There is no objection on behalf of the Respondent to extension of



mandate.

4. This Court is inclined to extend the mandate of the learned Arbitrator till 28.02.2026, so that the award can be pronounced and no further extension of time would be required by the learned Arbitrator.

5. The Petitions are disposed of, along with the pending applications, if any.

**SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD, J**

**FEBRUARY 24, 2025**

*Rahul*