



\$~81 to 87

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

+ O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 651/2025

M/S MADHU KISHAN GUPTA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Murari Tiwari with Mr. Kamal Nayan Tiwari, Ms. Nimisha Gupta and Ms. Indira Murthy, Advocates with Petitioner in person.

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjay Vashishtha, SC with Mr. Siddhartha Goswami and Ms. Geetanjali Reddy, Advocates.

82

+ O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 652/2025

M/S MADHU KISHAN GUPTA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Murari Tiwari with Mr. Kamal Nayan Tiwari, Ms. Nimisha Gupta and Ms. Indira Murthy, Advocates with Petitioner in person.

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjay Vashishtha, SC with Mr. Siddhartha Goswami and Ms. Geetanjali Reddy, Advocates.

83

+ O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 653/2025

M/S MADHU KISHAN GUPTA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Murari Tiwari with Mr. Kamal Nayan Tiwari, Ms. Nimisha Gupta and Ms. Indira



Murthy, Advocates with Petitioner in person.

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHIRespondent
Through: Mr. Sanjay Vashishtha, SC with Mr.
Siddhartha Goswami and Ms. Geetanjali Reddy,
Advocates.

84

+ O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 654/2025

M/S MADHU KISHAN GUPTAPetitioner
Through: Mr. Murari Tiwari with Mr. Kamal
Nayan Tiwari, Ms. Nimisha Gupta and Ms. Indira
Murthy, Advocates with Petitioner in person.

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHIRespondent
Through: Mr. Sanjay Vashishtha, SC with Mr.
Siddhartha Goswami and Ms. Geetanjali Reddy,
Advocates.

85

+ O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 655/2025

M/S MADHU KISHAN GUPTAPetitioner
Through: Mr. Murari Tiwari with Mr. Kamal
Nayan Tiwari, Ms. Nimisha Gupta and Ms. Indira
Murthy, Advocates with Petitioner in person.

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHIRespondent
Through: Mr. Sanjay Vashishtha, SC with Mr.
Siddhartha Goswami and Ms. Geetanjali Reddy,
Advocates.



86

+ O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 656/2025

M/S MADHU KISHAN GUPTA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Murari Tiwari with Mr. Kamal Nayan Tiwari, Ms. Nimisha Gupta and Ms. Indira Murthy, Advocates with Petitioner in person.

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjay Vashishtha, SC with Mr. Siddhartha Goswami and Ms. Geetanjali Reddy, Advocates.

87

+ O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 657/2025

M/S MADHU KISHAN GUPTA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Murari Tiwari with Mr. Kamal Nayan Tiwari, Ms. Nimisha Gupta and Ms. Indira Murthy, Advocates with Petitioner in person.

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjay Vashishtha, SC with Mr. Siddhartha Goswami and Ms. Geetanjali Reddy, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH

ORDER

%

20.08.2025

I.A. 20146/2025 (u/S 151 CPC) in O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 651/2025

I.A. 20150/2025 (u/S 151 CPC) in O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 652/2025



I.A. 20151/2025 (u/S 151 CPC) in O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 653/2025
I.A. 20155/2025 (u/S 151 CPC) in O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 654/2025
I.A. 20157/2025 (u/S 151 CPC) in O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 655/2025
I.A. 20160/2025 (u/S 151 CPC) in O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 656/2025
I.A. 20163/2025 (u/S 151 CPC) in O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 657/2025

1. These applications are filed on behalf of the Petitioner seeking condonation of delay of 9 days in re-filing the petitions.
2. Issue notice.
3. Mr. Sanjay Srivastava, learned Standing Counsel accepts notice on behalf of the Respondent.
4. For the reasons stated in the applications, the same are allowed. Delay of 9 days in re-filing the petitions stands condoned.
5. Applications are disposed of.

O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 651/2025
O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 652/2025
O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 653/2025
O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 654/2025
O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 655/2025
O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 656/2025
O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 657/2025

6. These petitions are filed on behalf of the Petitioner under Section 29A(4) and (5) of Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 ('1996 Act') seeking extension of mandate of the learned Sole Arbitrator by a period of six months.
7. Disputes having arisen between the parties in relation to the different Contracts which are subject matter of the arbitral proceedings, Petitioner filed petitions under Section 11(6) of 1996 Act in this Court being ARB.P. 724/2022, ARB.P. 725/2022, ARB.P. 726/2022 and ARB.P. 727/2022 seeking appointment of sole Arbitrator as also petitions being O.M.P. (T)



(COMM.) 80/2022, O.M.P. (T) (COMM.) 81/2022 and O.M.P. (T) (COMM.) 82/2022, seeking termination of mandate of the Arbitrator. These petitions were allowed by a common order dated 24.08.2022 appointing a substitute Arbitrator and terminating the mandate of the erstwhile Arbitrator. It is stated in the petitions that the arbitral proceedings are at the stage of final arguments and the mandate of the Arbitrator has expired on 19.07.2024.

8. Issue notice.

9. Mr. Sanjay Srivastava, learned Standing Counsel accepts notice on behalf of the Respondent in all the petitions and on instructions, submits that Respondent has no objection to the extension of mandate of the Arbitrator.

10. Having gone through the petitions, this Court is satisfied that sufficient cause is made out by the Petitioner for extension of mandate of the Arbitrator. Considering that arbitral proceedings are at the stage of final arguments, with the consent of the parties, mandate of the Arbitrator is extended by a period of 09 months from 20.08.2025 to enable the Arbitrator to pronounce and publish the award and period between 20.07.2024 to 19.08.2025 is regularized.

11. Petitions are allowed and disposed of in the aforesaid terms

JYOTI SINGH, J

AUGUST 20, 2025

S.Sharma/Shivam