



\$~5

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

ARB. A. (COMM.) 13/2025

SATTVIK MISHRA & ORS.

.....Appellants

Through: Ms. Avanti Tewari, Ms. Shubhi
Mehta, Advs.

versus

SCOOP WHOOP MEDIA PRIVATE LIMITED & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Alok Tiwari, Ms.
Dakshayani Saxena, Ms.
Kritika Bansal, Mr. Saurabh
Tiwari, Advs. for R-1, 2 & 3

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER

25.03.2025

%

1. This is an appeal filed under Section 37(2)(b) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (*"the Act"*) seeking to challenge the orders dated 19.02.2025, 21.02.2025 and 24.02.2025 in MCIA/Arb./106/2024 passed by the learned sole arbitrator, refusing ad interim protection in a Section 17 application filed by the appellants.
2. The said application was filed by the appellants on 16.02.2025, fearing that the respondents were dissipating assets, particularly respondent No.1 company, which would render the arbitration award ineffective.
3. On 19.02.2025, the learned arbitrator declined the request of the appellants for an ad interim protection till further hearing on 21.02.2025, citing insufficient evidence of a signed Term Sheet for a sale. The learned arbitrator did not issue any order of interim



protection after the hearing on 21.02.2025 and listed the matter for further hearing on 24.02.2025. On 24.02.2025, the learned arbitrator passed the impugned order declining any relief to the appellants, citing a misunderstanding of the transaction documents by the appellants.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellants states that the learned arbitrator disregarded evidence of the imminent sale, the impugned orders lack merit and is seeking to have them set aside and obtain interim protection against any asset alienation by the respondents.
5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents states that the impugned orders passed by the learned arbitrator are just, fair, reasonable and based on consideration of the information and material before the learned arbitrator.
6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material on record.
7. With consent of the parties, it is directed that the learned arbitrator shall treat the observations made in the impugned order dated 24.02.2025 only as interim observations and will adjudicate the Section 17 application uninfluenced by the observations made in the impugned order dated 24.02.2025.
8. It is further directed that the respondents shall disclose on an affidavit before the next date of hearing before the learned arbitrator, the status of respondent No.1 company regarding the consideration received and the date when the sale has fructified.
9. Additionally, the para SS of the present appeal is hereby expunged as



the same includes personal remarks against the arbitrator, which reads as under:

“SS. The application before the Ld. Arbitrator was a section 17 application for interim reliefs seeking protection from the subject matter of the dispute from being squandered away. While the Hon'ble Tribunal has miserably failed in protecting the same, it has also indicated that the Tribunal is unlikely to grant the final relief. It is submitted that the Hon'ble Tribunal ought not to have passed any findings with respect to the final relief and the same are liable to be set aside.”

10. It is pertinent to note that except the above-mentioned observations, this Court has not commented on the impugned order dated 24.02.2025.
11. Hence, the appeal is disposed of accordingly.

JASMEET SINGH, J

MARCH 25, 2025/sp

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)