



\$~58

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

+ **O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 744/2025**

M/S INDIAN POTASH LIMITED

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Manish Kaushik and Mr.
Yashpriya Sahran, Advocates.

versus

M/S PREM SAKHI FERTILIZER LIMITED

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Jeevesh Nagrath, Sr. Advocate
with Mr. Arjun Gaur and Ms. Nitya Maheshwari,
Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH

ORDER

09.09.2025

%

I.A. 22130/2025 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 744/2025

3. This petition is filed on behalf of the Petitioner under Section 29A (4) and (5) of Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 ('1996 Act') seeking extension of the mandate of the learned Sole Arbitrator by a period of six months.
4. Disputes having arisen between the parties, Petitioner filed a petition under Section 11(6) of 1996 Act seeking appointment of the Sole Arbitrator, being ARB.P. 228/2020, which was allowed on 27.07.2020, appointing a Sole Arbitrator. Mandate of the Arbitrator was successively extended by this



Court and lastly vide order dated 05.09.2024 in O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 684/2024 by a period of one year, which has expired on 04.09.2025. It is stated that award has been reserved for pronouncement by the Arbitrator and thus, mandate be extended to enable the Arbitrator to pronounce the award.

5. Issue notice.

6. Mr. Arjun Gaur, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the Respondent and on instructions, submits that Respondent has no objection to the extension of mandate of the Arbitrator *albeit* the allegations as also the averments in the petition, pertaining to merits of the disputes are denied.

7. Accordingly, with the consent of the parties, mandate of the learned Sole Arbitrator is extended by a period of 06 months from 05.09.2025.

8. Petition is allowed and disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

JYOTI SINGH, J

SEPTEMBER 9, 2025

S.Sharma