



\$~68

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

+ O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 499/2025

MANPOWERGROUP SERVICES INDIA
PVT. LTD.

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rahul Jain, Advocate

versus

SKILLSTECH SERVICES PRIVATE LIMITEDRespondent

Through: Ms. Beavula Jemima and Mr. Manik
Gupta, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH

ORDER

07.07.2025

%

1. This petition is filed on behalf of the Petitioner under Section 29A (4) and (5) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 ('1996 Act') seeking extension of the mandate of the learned Arbitral Tribunal by a period of 12 months.

2. Disputes having arisen between the parties in respect of Agreement dated 03.10.2017 executed between the Petitioner and the Respondent, Petitioner filed a petition under Section 9 of the 1996 Act being OMP (I) (COMM) 299/2021 in which the Court appointed a sole Arbitrator to adjudicate the disputes. In the present case, this Court extended the mandate of the Arbitrator vide order dated 15.03.2024 upto 30.09.2024, which was further extended in OMP (MISC) (COMM) No. 780/2024 upto 30.04.2025 vide order dated 04.10.2024.

3. It is stated in the petition that in all five arbitrations are on going between the parties simultaneously before the same Arbitrator. The



Arbitrator has with the consent of the parties decided that one arbitral proceeding will be concluded at one time and thereafter, the arguments will be heard in the others one after the other and schedule for final arguments is yet to be fixed for the instant case. In this backdrop, extension of the mandate is sought.

4. Issue notice.

5. Ms. Beavula Jemima, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the Respondent and objects to the extension of mandate on the ground that nearly four and a half years have passed since the arbitral proceedings commenced.

6. Learned counsel for the Petitioner, on the other hand, submits that with the consent of the parties, it was decided that all five arbitrations *inter se* the parties will be conducted simultaneously. The documents involved are voluminous and the matters being technical, it took time to complete the pleadings and the present arbitration is at the stage of final arguments for which the dates will be scheduled shortly by the learned Arbitrator.

7. It is seen from the averments in the petition and procedural orders on record that the learned Arbitrator is simultaneously proceeding with five contested arbitrations between the parties involving technical issues and voluminous records. Part arguments have been heard in one of the arbitration cases while dates for arguments in the present case are yet to be fixed. Chronology of dates and events as also the orders passed by the learned Arbitrator from time to time does not reflect any delay on the part of the Petitioner. In my view, Petitioner has made out sufficient cause for extension of the mandate.



8. Accordingly, this petition is allowed and disposed of extending the mandate of the learned Arbitrator by a period of six months from today and the period between 01.05.2025 to 06.07.2025 is regularised.

JYOTI SINGH, J

JULY 07, 2025/Shivam