



\$~5 (OS)

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

+ O.M.P.(I) (COMM.) 203/2025 & I.A. 14761/2025

RAMAYNA ISPAT PRIVATE LIMITEDPetitioner

Through: Mr. S. Kashyap, Ms. Parul Tuli, Ms.
Nistha Gupta and Ms. Mahima,
Advocates

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Ritin Rai, Sr. Adv. with Ms.
Anuja Tiwari & Mr. Daksh Kadian,
Advocates (Through VC)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

% **23.06.2025**

1. Learned senior counsel for the Respondents states that Respondents have filed a review petition with respect to the order dated 28.05.2025, which is not listed today and they accordingly, seek an adjournment.
2. At request of the Respondents, adjourned to **07.07.2025**.
3. In reply, learned senior counsel for the Petitioner states that due to the non-appointment of the nominee arbitrator by the Respondent, no hearing could be held by the Arbitral Tribunal on 14.06.2025.
4. In response, learned senior counsel for the Respondents state that there is no urgency in the reliefs sought. He states that Respondents remain ready and willing to appoint an Arbitrator, however, they would first like to press the review petition.
5. This Court has heard the parties. This petition was disposed of vide consent order dated 28.05.2025, with the understanding that this petition will be treated as a Section 17 petition and placed before the Arbitral Tribunal on 14.06.2025 for consideration. It is a matter of record that however, no



hearing could be held on 14.06.2025, as the Respondent failed to nominate its arbitrator despite having undertaken to appoint its nominee on or before 05.06.2025. In these facts, the Petitioner cannot be left remediless.

6. Until the next date of hearing or constitution of Arbitral Tribunal, whichever is earlier, the parties are directed to maintain status quo.

7. The digitally signed copy of this order, duly uploaded on the official website of the Delhi High Court, www.delhihighcourt.nic.in, shall be treated as a certified copy of the order for the purpose of ensuring compliance. No physical copy of order shall be insisted by any authority/entity or litigant.

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA
(VACATION JUDGE)

JUNE 23, 2025/rhc

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