



\$~195

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

+ W.P.(C) 14541/2025, CM APPL. 59667/2025

ELITE PROJECTS PVT LTD

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Aayush Agarwala, Mr. Siddhant Jaiswal, Mr. Sourav Dutta, Mr. Rahul Kumar Yadav, Mr. Abhishek Verma, Advs.

versus

DELHI LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY SECRETARIAT N C T OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Santosh Kumar Rout (SC), Mr. Surjeet Singh, Adv. for R2

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA

ORDER

25.09.2025

%

1. *Vide order dated 19.09.2025, passed in the present proceedings, it was recorded as under:-*

“1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner being aggrieved by a letter dated 19.11.2024 issued by the respondent no.1/Legislative Assembly Secretariat, Government of NCT of Delhi, by virtue of which the License Agreement of petitioner dated 24.06.2021 for “Licensing out space for installation of mobile network tower at Delhi Legislative Assembly” has been terminated. The petitioner is also aggrieved by the consequential action

sought to be taken by the respondents pursuant to the issuance of the impugned letter.

2. Although the learned senior counsel for the petitioner strenuously presses for interim relief, after some hearing, he submits that it would suffice for the purpose of the petitioner if the respondents agree for appointment of an arbitrator in these proceedings itself.



3. Learned counsel for the respondent no.1, who appears on advance notice, seeks some time to take instructions.

4. List on 25.09.2025, in the category of “Supplementary Matters”.

5. Till the next date of hearing, no coercive steps shall be taken against the petitioner.”

2. During the course of proceedings, today, learned counsel for the respondent no.1 submits that the said respondent is agreeable for appointment of an arbitrator in these proceedings itself for adjudication of the disputes between the parties.

3. Accordingly, at joint request of respective counsel for the parties, Mr. Trideep Pais, Senior Advocate (Mob. +91 9643773032) is appointed as the Sole Arbitrator to adjudicate the disputes between the parties. It is further agreed that:

- i. the respondent shall be at liberty to raise preliminary objections as regards arbitrability/jurisdiction, if any, which shall be decided by the arbitrator, in accordance with law.
- ii. the learned Sole Arbitrator may proceed with the arbitration proceedings subject to furnishing to the parties requisite disclosure as required under Section 12 of the A&C Act.
- iii. the learned Sole Arbitrator shall be entitled to fee in accordance with IVth Schedule to the A&C Act; or as may otherwise be agreed to between the parties and the learned Sole Arbitrator.
- iv. All rights and contentions of the parties in relation to the claims/counter claims are kept open, to be decided by the learned Sole Arbitrator on their merits, in accordance with law.



4. The interim order dated 19.09.2025, shall continue to subsist till the matter is taken up for consideration by the learned Sole Arbitrator.
5. Needless to say, nothing in this order shall be construed as an expression of opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.
6. The present petition is disposed of in the above terms.

SACHIN DATTA, J

SEPTEMBER 25, 2025/uk