



\$~2

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

+ **ARB.P. 962/2025**

DR. ER. RAJAINDEERR JAINAPetitioner

Through: None.

versus

ROHIT DUARespondent

Through: Mr. Jaskaran Singh, Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT BANSAL

ORDER

%

08.10.2025

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 11(6) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (hereinafter 'Act') seeking appointment of an Arbitrator in terms of Clause 19 of the License Agreement dated 28th March, 2007 entered into between the parties.
2. At the hearing on 11th September, 2025, none appeared on behalf of the petitioner. Today also, none appears on behalf of the petitioner.
3. On the aforesaid date, the statement of counsel for the respondent was noted that there is no Arbitration Agreement between the petitioner and the respondent. It was further noted that the License Agreement dated 28th March, 2007 (*wrongly noted as dated 13th August, 2018*) that has been filed along with the petition (*pages 24-39 of the petition*) is between another entity, *i.e., M/s Lord Builders Private Limited* and the respondent.
4. It was further submitted that the aforesaid company has been struck



off from the MCA records.

5. The reply of the respondent is on record, wherein the same stand has been taken by the respondent that there is no valid Arbitration Agreement between the petitioner and the respondent.

6. It is further submitted that the premises, in respect of which the disputes has arisen, has also been handed over to the petitioner.

7. Be that as it may, none has been appearing on behalf of the petitioner.

8. The present petition is accordingly dismissed for non-prosecution.

AMIT BANSAL, J

OCTOBER 8, 2025

Vivek/-