



\$~O-1 & O-2

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

+ ARB.P. 2064/2024

PRISCILLA ALBUQUERQUE

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr.Dhruv Gautam and Mr.Tushar
Tyagi, Advs.

versus

SPIRE TECHPARK PRIVATE LIMITED

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Astha Nigam and Mr.Shivam
Rajpal, Advs.

O-2

+ ARB.P. 2065/2024

AJAY BAGLA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr.Dhruv Gautam and Mr.Tushar
Tyagi, Advs.

versus

SPIRE TECHPARK PRIVATE LIMITED

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Astha Nigam and Mr.Shivam
Rajpal, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

10.01.2025

1. Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.
2. The facts of these cases clearly indicate that the parties had entered



into a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) and Article 9 thereto, specifically provides for dispute resolution mechanism.

3. There is no objection by the respondent in appointing an arbitrator to decide the dispute involved in the instant cases.

4. The Court takes note of the fact that with respect to almost a similar MoU, the Court in **ARB.P.1156/2024**, appointed Ms. Shreya Vedantika Mehra, Advocate (Mob No.+91 9910027557) as the Sole Arbitrator.

5. Looking at the similarity of the dispute involved in the instant cases, the Court appoints Ms. Shreya Vedantika Mehra, Advocate (Mob No.+91 9910027557) as the Sole Arbitrator to adjudicate the dispute between the parties.

6. The Sole Arbitrator may proceed with the arbitration proceedings, subject to furnishing to the parties, requisite disclosures as required under Section 12 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (hereinafter referred as “A&C Act”).

7. The Sole Arbitrator shall be entitled to fee in accordance with the IVth Schedule of the A&C Act; or as may otherwise be agreed to between the parties and the learned Sole Arbitrator.

8. The parties shall share the arbitrator's fee and arbitral cost, equally.

9. 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.

10. 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. All rights and contentions of the parties in this regard are reserved.



11. Accordingly, the instant petitions stand disposed of.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J
JANUARY 10, 2025/MJ/AM