



2025:DHC:11208



\$-12

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**+ **ARB.P. 1861/2025**Date of Decision: **28.11.2025****IN THE MATTER OF:**

AXIS FINANCE LIMITED
THROUGH ITS AUTHORISED SIGNATORY
HAVING ITS REGIONAL OFFICE AT
AXIS FINANCE LTD, 85-A, 1ST & 2ND FLOOR,
RISHYAMOOK BUILDING, PANCHKUIAN ROAD,
NEAR R.K. ASHRAM MARG METRO, NEW DELHI-110001

..... PETITIONER

Through: Mr. Raveesh Thukral, Advocate.

Versus

SAURABH PANCHAL
A-11, AVALONS GREENWOODS, OPP
HANUMAN TEMPLE, MAHAPURA ROAD, SEVASI,
VADODARA, GUJARAT – 391101

DHARA SAURABH PANCHAL
A-11, AVALONS GREENWOODS, OPP
HANUMAN TEMPLE, MAHAPURA ROAD, SEVASI,
VADODARA, GUJARAT - 391101

.... RESPONDENTS

Through:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV**JUDGEMENT****PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J. (ORAL)**

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:AMIT KUMAR
SHARMA
Signing Date:11.12.2025
12:22:59



Signature Not Verified
Signed
By:PURUSHAINDRA
KUMAR KAURAV





1. The present petition has been filed under Section 11 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (*the Act*), seeking appointment of an Arbitrator, to adjudicate upon the disputes that have arisen between the parties under Facility Agreement dated 30.08.2022 (*the Agreement*).

2. As per the affidavit of service filed on behalf of the petitioner, the respondent has been duly served on email and Whatsapp at the email-address and number forming a part of the Agreement. The affidavit of service is extracted below, for reference:

“I, Raveesh Thukral, Counsel for Petitioner having office at B-68, Basement Lajpat Nagar -I New Delhi-I I 0024 do hereby solemnly affirm and declare as under:

1. The deponent is the counsel for the Petitioner in the above matter and is well conversant with the facts and circumstances of the case and is thus competent to swear this affidavit.

2. The entire copy of the Petition u/s 11 of the Arbitration & Conciliation Act, 1996 along with Notice has been sent by the Petitioner to the Respondent Through Speed Post, Whatsapp and Email in terms of direction passed by this Hon'ble Court.

3. Copy of the postal receipt along with tracking Report, Whatsapp and email dated 24.11.2025. Copy of proof of service is annexed as ANNEXURE A-1 (colly). The Email is Not Bounced Back

4. This is my true and correct statement”

3. Despite service, none appears for the respondents. Therefore, the Court proceeds with the matter in their absence.

4. The case of the petitioner is that it is a non-banking finance company, and had advanced to the respondents a loan of Rs. 29,95,998/- (Rupees Twenty-Nine Lakh Ninety-Five Thousand Nine Hundred and Ninety-Eight only) under the terms of the Agreement. As per the Agreement, the respondents were to repay the same in sixty monthly instalments along with



interest. However, the respondents are claimed to have defaulted in the repayment of the loan and as per the statement of accounts, a sum of Rs. 25,59,172/- (Rupees Twenty-Five Lakh Fifty-Nine Thousand One Hundred and Seventy-Two only) remains due as on 05.09.2025.

5. The Court takes note of Clause 35 of the Agreement, which provides for resolution of disputes by way of arbitration. The same is extracted below, for reference:-

"35. Arbitration

All disputes, differences and/or claim or questions arising out of these presents or in any way touching or concerning the same or as to constructions, meaning or effect thereof or as to the right, obligations and liabilities of the parties hereunder shall be referred to and settled by arbitration, to be held in accordance with the provisions of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 or any statutory amendments thereof, of a sole arbitrator to be nominated by the Lender, and in the event of death, unwillingness, refusal, neglect, inability or incapability of a person so appointed to act as an arbitrator, the Lender may appoint a new arbitrator to be a sole arbitrator. The arbitrator shall not be required to give any reasons for the award and the award of the arbitrator shall be final and binding on all parties concerned. The arbitration proceedings shall be held Mumbai/Delhi."

6. The law with respect to the scope and standard of judicial scrutiny under Section 11(6) of the Act has been fairly well settled. This Court in ***Pradhaan Air Express Pvt Ltd v. Air Works India Engineering Pvt Ltd***¹ has extensively dealt with the scope of interference at the stage of Section 11 reference. Furthermore, in ***Axis Finance Limited Vs. Mr. Agam Ishwar Trimbak***,² this Court has held that the scope of inquiry under Section 11 of the Act is limited to a *prima facie* examination of the *existence* of an

¹ 2025 SCC OnLine Del 3022

² 2025:DHC:7477



arbitration agreement. Further, it was also reiterated that objections relating to the arbitrability of disputes are not to be entertained by a referral Court acting under Section 8 or 11 of the Act. The relevant extract of the aforesaid decision reads as under: -

“19. In In Re: Interplay, the Supreme Court confined the analysis under Section 11 of the Act to the existence of an arbitration agreement and under Section 8 of the Act to the existence and validity of an arbitration agreement. Under both the provisions, examination was to be made at the touchstone of Section 7 of the Act. Further, issues pertaining to the arbitrability of the dispute fell outside the scope of both Section 11(6A) and Section 8 of the Act. The material part of the judgement of the Supreme Court in In Re: Interplay reads as under:

164. The 2015 Amendment Act has laid down different parameters for judicial review under Section 8 and Section 11. Where Section 8 requires the referral Court to look into the prima facie existence of a valid arbitration agreement. Section 11 confines the Court's jurisdiction to the examination of the existence of an arbitration agreement. Although the object and purpose behind both Sections 8 and 11 is to compel parties to abide by their contractual understanding, the scope of power of the referral Courts under the said provisions is intended to be different. The same is also evident from the fact that Section 37 of the Arbitration Act allows an appeal from the order of an arbitral tribunal refusing to refer the parties to arbitration under Section 8, but not from Section 11. Thus, the 2015 Amendment Act has legislatively overruled the dictum of Patel Engineering (supra) where it was held that Section 8 and Section 11 are complementary in nature. Accordingly, the two provisions cannot be read as laying down a similar standard. 165. The legislature confined the scope of reference under Section 11(6A) to the examination of the existence of an arbitration agreement. The use of the term “examination” in itself connotes that the scope of the power is limited to a prima facie determination. Since the Arbitration Act is a self-contained code, the requirement of “existence” of an arbitration agreement draws effect from Section 7 of the Arbitration Act. In Duro Felguera (supra), this Court held that the referral Courts only need to consider one aspect to determine the existence of an arbitration agreement – whether the underlying contract contains an arbitration agreement which provides for arbitration pertaining to the disputes which have arisen between the parties to the agreement. Therefore, the scope of examination under Section 11(6A) should





be confined to the existence of an arbitration agreement on the basis of Section 7. Similarly, the validity of an arbitration agreement, in view of Section 7, should be restricted to the requirement of formal validity such as the requirement that the agreement be in writing. This interpretation also gives true effect to the doctrine of competence-competence by leaving the issue of substantive existence and validity of an arbitration agreement to be decided by arbitral tribunal under Section 16. We accordingly clarify the position of law laid down in Vidya Drolia (supra) in the context of Section 8 and Section 11 of the Arbitration Act, 1996. The burden of proving the existence of arbitration agreement generally lies on the party seeking to rely on such agreement. In jurisdictions such as India, which accept the doctrine of competence-competence, only prima facie proof of the existence of an arbitration agreement must be adduced before the referral Court. The referral Court is not the appropriate forum to conduct a mini-trial by allowing the parties to adduce the evidence in regard to the existence or validity of an arbitration agreement. The determination of the existence and validity of an arbitration agreement on the basis of evidence ought to be left to the arbitral tribunal. This position of law can also be gauged from the plain language of the statute. 167. Section 11(6A) uses the expression “examination of the existence of an arbitration agreement.” The purport of using the word “examination” connotes that the legislature intends that the referral Court has to inspect or scrutinize the dealings between the parties for the existence of an arbitration agreement. Moreover, the expression “examination” does not connote or imply a laborious or contested inquiry. On the other hand, Section 16 provides that the arbitral tribunal can “rule” on its jurisdiction, including the existence and validity of an arbitration agreement. A “ruling” connotes adjudication of disputes after admitting evidence from the parties. Therefore, it is evident that the referral Court is only required to examine the existence of arbitration agreements, whereas the arbitral tribunal ought to rule on its jurisdiction, including the issues pertaining to the existence and validity of an arbitration agreement. A similar view was adopted by this Court in Shin-Etsu Chemical Co. Ltd. v. Aksh Optifibre Ltd.” [Emphasis supplied]

20. The effect of In Re: Interplay was further explained by a Three Judge Bench of the Supreme Court in SBI General Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Krish Spinning³ wherein the Court declared Vidya Drolia and NTPC Ltd.’s findings qua scope of inquiry under Section 8 and Section 11 of the Act to

³ 2024 SCC OnLine SC 1754



no longer be compatible with modern principles of arbitration. The material portions of the judgement read as under:

“114. In view of the observations made by this Court in In Re : Interplay (supra), it is clear that the scope of enquiry at the stage of appointment of arbitrator is limited to the scrutiny of prima facie existence of the arbitration agreement, and nothing else. For this reason, we find it difficult to hold that the observations made in Vidya Drolia (supra) and adopted in NTPC v. SPML (supra) that the jurisdiction of the referral Court when dealing with the issue of “accord and satisfaction” under Section 11 extends to weeding out ex-facie non-arbitrable and frivolous disputes would continue to apply despite the subsequent decision in In Re : Interplay (supra). ... 118. Tests like the “eye of the needle” and “ex-facie meritless”, although try to minimise the extent of judicial interference, yet they require the referral Court to examine contested facts and appreciate prima facie evidence (however limited the scope of enquiry may be) and thus are not in conformity with the principles of modern arbitration which place arbitral autonomy and judicial non-interference on the highest pedestal.” [Emphasis supplied]

21. Similarly, in *BGM and M-RPL-JMCT (JV) v. Eastern Coalfields Ltd*⁴ the Supreme Court succinctly explained the effect of *In Re: Interplay* on a Referral Court’s powers under Section 11 of the Act. The relevant part of the judgement is as under:

15. ...

(a) Section 11 confines the Court's jurisdiction to the examination regarding the existence of an arbitration agreement.

(b) The use of the term “examination” in itself connotes that the scope of the power is limited to a prima facie determination.

(c) Referral Courts only need to consider one aspect to determine the existence of an arbitration agreement — whether the underlying contract contains an arbitration agreement which provides for arbitration pertaining to the disputes which have arisen between the parties to the agreement. Therefore, the scope of examination under Section 11(6-A) should be confined to the existence of an arbitration agreement on the basis of Section 7. Such a legal approach will help the Referral Court in weeding out prima facie non-existent arbitration agreements.

(d) The purport of using the word “examination” connotes that the legislature intends that the Referral Court has to inspect or

⁴ 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1471





scrutinise the dealings between the parties for the existence of an arbitration agreement. However, the expression “examination” does not connote or imply a laborious or contested inquiry.

(e) The burden of proving the existence of arbitration agreement generally lies on the party seeking to rely on such agreement. Only prima facie proof of the existence of an arbitration agreement must be adduced before the Referral Court. The Referral Court is not the appropriate forum to conduct a mini-trial by allowing the parties to adduce the evidence in regard to the existence or validity of an arbitration agreement. The determination of the existence and validity of an arbitration agreement on the basis of evidence ought to be left to the Arbitral Tribunal.

(f) Section 16 provides that the Arbitral Tribunal can “rule” on its jurisdiction, including the existence and validity of an arbitration agreement. A “ruling” connotes adjudication of disputes after admitting evidence from the parties. Therefore, when the Referral Court renders a prima facie opinion, neither the Arbitral Tribunal, nor the Court enforcing the arbitral award is bound by such a prima facie view. If a prima facie view as to the existence of an arbitration agreement is taken by the Referral Court, it still allows the Arbitral Tribunal to examine the issue in depth.
[Emphasis supplied]

22. Thus from the above-mentioned authorities it is clear that a Court’s scope of inquiry under Section 11 of the Act has been limited to a prima facie examination of the existence of an arbitration agreement while the adjudication under Section 8 is to be made for both existence and validity. Further, the examination so undertaken under both the said provisions must be within the confines of Section 7 of the Act. Objections relating to arbitrability of disputes are not to be entertained by a referral Court acting under Section 8 or 11 of the Act.”

7. In view of the aforesaid legal position and the existence of an arbitration clause in the Agreement, there is no impediment in appointing the Arbitrator. Accordingly, Mr. Yatin Sharma, Advocate (Mobile No.+91 98101 62206, e-mail id: yatin.sharma@aureuslaw.com) is appointed as the sole Arbitrator to adjudicate the dispute between the parties.

8. The arbitration would take place under the aegis of the Delhi





International Arbitration Centre (DIAC) and in terms of its rules and regulations. The learned Arbitrator shall be entitled to fees as per the Schedule of Fees maintained by the DIAC.

9. The learned arbitrator is also requested to file the requisite disclosure under Section 12 (2) of the Act within a week of entering on reference.

10. All rights and contentions of the parties in relation to the claims/counter-claims are kept open, to be decided by the Sole Arbitrator on their merits, in accordance with law.

11. Needless to say, nothing in this order shall be construed as an expression of opinion of this Court on the merits of the controversy between the parties. Let a copy of the instant order be sent to the Sole Arbitrator through electronic mode as well.

12. Accordingly, the instant petition stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINdra KUMAR KAURAV, J

NOVEMBER 28, 2025

Ng./amg