



\$~48

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

+ O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 372/2025 & I.A. 11598/2025

M/S PRAGATI PAPER MILLS PVT LTDPetitioner

Through: Mr. Ajay Kohli and Ms. Dipika
Prasad, Advs.

versus

NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION TRANSPORT CORPORATION
LTDRespondent

Through: Mr. Vishwajeet Tyagi, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

% **08.05.2025**

I.A. 11598/2025 (for exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Accordingly, this application stands disposed of.

O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 372/2025

3. This is a petition under Section 29A of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 [“the Act”] for extension of the mandate of the Arbitral Tribunal comprising of a Sole Arbitrator i.e., Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Garg.

4. It is stated in the petition that the pleadings in the matter before the Arbitral Tribunal were completed on 11.09.2023 and the period of 12 months as envisaged under Section 29A (1) expired on 11.09.2024. Thereafter, the parties continued to participate in the arbitration proceedings and even addressed their final arguments, which were



concluded on 23.10.2024. Further on the said date i.e. 23.10.2024, the matter was reserved for Award with the direction to the parties to file their written submission by 05.12.2024, which stands filed.

5. It is stated that the period of six months as envisaged under Section 29A(3) of the Act expired on 11.03.2025 and the award has still yet to be pronounced, therefore, the parties have mutually consented to extend the mandate of Arbitral Tribunal, therefore, the present petition has been filed.

6. Learned counsel for the Petitioner states that the matter is at the stage of the pronouncement of the award and it is pending for want of extension of mandate of the Arbitral Tribunal.

7. Issue notice to the Respondent. Mr. Vishwajeet Tyagi, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of the Respondent. He states that the direction to file this petition was issued by the learned Arbitrator to the Petitioner on 17.02.2025. He states that, however, this petition has been filed belatedly. He states that the Respondent has no objection to the extension of the mandate of the Arbitral Tribunal. He states that however, considering the period is to be reckoned from 17.02.2025, the Respondent is consenting to extension of the mandate till 30.06.2025.

8. Learned counsel for the Petitioner states that the petition was duly filed in April, 2025 and the mandate of the Arbitral Tribunal expired on 11.03.2025, therefore, that there is no basis for the Respondent to allege delay with respect to filing of the present petition.

9. This Court has considered the submissions of the parties. It is a matter of record that the Respondent too could have also moved this petition for seeking extension of the mandate of the Arbitral Tribunal. However, no steps were taken by the Respondent and therefore, this Court finds no merit



in the objection being raised by the Respondent on the allegation of delay (by Petitioner). The Petitioner does not stand to gain by any such delay.

10. Learned counsel for the Petitioner states that she has no objection if the time period is extended to 30.06.2025.

11. Keeping in view the intervening June Vacation, the petition is allowed and the mandate of the Arbitral Tribunal for publishing the award is extended up to 31.07.2025.

12. Accordingly, the petition is disposed of, along with the pending applications, if any.

MAY 8, 2025/msh/ms

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

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