



\$~32

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

+ **W.P.(C) 16084/2025 and CM APPL.65859/2025**

TAURANT PROJECTS LIMITEDPetitioner

Through: Ms. Jyoti Nambiar and Mr. Kunal
Narwal, Advocates.

versus

M/S GAIL (INDIA) LTD.Respondent

Through: Mr. Ratan Kumar Singh, Sr. Adv.
alongwith Mr. Nikhilesh Krishnan,
Mr. Jai Pratap, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA

ORDER

%

17.10.2025

CM APPL.65860/2025 (Exemption)

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

W.P.(C) 16084/2025

3. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking quashing of the orders dated 18.08.2025 and 23.09.3035 passed by the Ld. Sole Arbitrator, whereby the Ld. Arbitrator rejected various applications filed by the petitioner for taking on record additional documents/affidavits as 'Volume VI' in the ongoing arbitral proceedings. The petition further seeks that appropriate issues be framed by the Ld. Arbitrator.
4. It is the case of the petitioner that certain aspects could not be brought to the attention of the Ld. Arbitrator which necessitated filing of additional documents/affidavit, whereas the respondent was allowed, belatedly to place on record certain documents, in the arbitral proceedings.



5. Given the extremely narrow limits of the jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India *qua* arbitral proceedings, this Court is not inclined to interdict with the orders passed by the learned sole arbitrator, or interfere with the conduct of arbitration proceedings.¹

6. After some hearing, learned counsel for the petitioner confines herself to seeking that the petitioner be allowed to re-agitate before the learned sole arbitrator, the issue of filing certain additional documents/affidavits, to emphasize the imperative necessity of the same.

7. In the circumstances, the present petition is dismissed, while granting liberty to the petitioner to file an appropriate application before the learned Sole Arbitrator, seeking leave to file additional documents/evidence. Needless to say, the same shall be considered by the learned sole arbitrator taking into account all relevant aspects. It is further agreed by the learned counsel for the petitioner that in the event of the learned Arbitrator favourably considering the petitioner's application, the additional incremental arbitral fees and costs that will be entailed (*inter-alia* on account of additional evidentiary and other hearings), shall be borne solely by the petitioner.

SACHIN DATTA, J

OCTOBER 17, 2025/at,ys

¹ *Bhaven Constructions vs Executive Engineer, Sardar Sarovar Narmada Nigam Limited and Anr.*, (2022) 1 SCC 75; *Sadbhav Engineering Ltd. vs Micro and Small Enterprises Facilitation Council and Ors.*, 2025 SCC Online Del 319; *Surender Kumar Singhal and Ors. vs Arun Kumar Bhalotia and Ors.*, 2021 SCC Online Del 3708.