



\$~3

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

+ **FAO(OS) (COMM) 242/2024 & CM APPL. 65036/2024**

**RSMM GENERAL TRADING LLC** .....Appellant

Through: Mr. Sameer Jain, Ms. Jayashree  
Parihar, Ms. Aastha Sharma  
and Mr. Manu Kumar, Advs.

versus

**HONASA CONSUMER LIMITED** .....Respondent

Through: Adv. Amita Katragadda, Adv.  
Nayani Aggarwal, Adv. Karan  
Motianj, Advs.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH VAIDYANATHAN  
SHANKAR**

**ORDER**

% **01.09.2025**

1. The present Appeal has been filed by the Appellant seeking to challenge an order 20.08.2025 [hereinafter referred to as 'Impugned Order'] passed by the learned Single Judge while deciding a Petition filed by the Respondent under Section 9 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.
2. The matter has already been referred to the Arbitrator, where it is pending.
3. Learned counsel representing the Appellant submits that the present Appeal may be disposed of with the observation that the finding recorded in the Impugned Order shall not be construed as a final expression on the merits of the case.
4. A perusal of the record reflects that the Petition filed by the



Respondent under Section 9 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 was for interim arrangement or direction. Hence, the application was decided on the basis of *prima facie* observations as already noticed in Paragraph No. 37(viii) of the Impugned Judgment passed by the learned Single Judge.

5. The present Appeal is accordingly disposed of with the foregoing observation.

6. This Court has no doubt that the learned Arbitrator will proceed to decide the matter uninfluenced by the observations made in the Impugned Order.

**ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.**

**HARISH VAIDYANATHAN SHANKAR, J.**  
**SEPTEMBER 01, 2025/jn/rgk**