



\$~9

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

+ **O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 301/2025**

SWASTIK PIPE LIMITED

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Jain and Ms. Ankita
Kedia, Advocates.

versus

MADAN BASSI SOLE PROPRIETOR OF M/S SURAJ UDYOG

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Ravi Ranjan, Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH

ORDER

21.04.2025

%

I.A. 8598/2025

1. This is an application preferred on behalf of the Petitioner seeking condonation of delay of 49 days in re-filing the petition.
2. Mr. Ravi Ranjan, learned counsel enters appearance on behalf of the Respondent and accepts notice.
3. For the reasons stated in the application, the same is allowed and disposed of, condoning the delay of 49 days.

O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 301/2025

4. This petition is preferred on behalf of the Petitioner under Section 29A (4) and (5) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 ('1996 Act') seeking extension of mandate of the Arbitral Tribunal by a period of 06 months.
5. Disputes having arisen between the parties in relation to certain



Purchase Orders-cum-Tax Invoices executed between the parties on 23.11.2018 along with Debit Notes dated 26.12.2019, Petitioner invoked Clause 2 which contained the Arbitration Agreement and sought appointment of an Arbitrator. Respondent failed to respond and Petitioner filed Arb. P. 181/2020 before this Court which was allowed vide order dated 07.01.2022 appointing a Sole Arbitrator. Learned Arbitrator entered upon reference on 15.06.2022 and after completion of pleadings, issues were framed and Petitioner filed list of witnesses along with evidence affidavit on 30.08.2022.

6. It is stated in the petition that on 14.11.2022, statement of CW-1 was recorded and he was cross-examined. On 10.03.2023, Petitioner filed evidence by way of affidavit of CW-2. Statement of CW-3 was recorded on 14.04.2023 and he was cross-examined. By mutual consent, parties extended the mandate of the Arbitrator by six months on 14.04.2023. Thereafter, two more witnesses of the Petitioner were examined and Petitioner filed a petition under Section 29A of the 1996 Act seeking extension of the mandate. By order dated 12.03.2024, in O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 198/2024, mandate of the Arbitrator was extended by six months w.e.f. 28.01.2024. It is the case of the Petitioner that the arbitration proceedings are at the stage of final arguments and therefore extension is sought.

7. Mr. Ravi Ranjan, learned counsel enters appearance on behalf of the Respondent and accepts notice. On instructions, it is submitted that Respondent has no objection to the extension of mandate of the learned Arbitrator.

8. With the consent of the parties, mandate of the learned Arbitrator is extended by a period of six months from 21.04.2025 and period between



29.07.2024 to 20.04.2025 is regularised. Learned Arbitrator is requested to complete the proceedings and pass and publish the award as expeditiously as possible.

9. Petition is allowed and disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

JYOTI SINGH, J

APRIL 21, 2025/shivam