



\$~24

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

+ **FAO(OS) (COMM) 199/2025 & CM APPLs. 77111-77114/2025**

STATE BANK OF INDIA

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. N. Venkataraman, ASG with Mr. Sanjay Kapur, Mr. Surya Prakash and Mr. Abhishek Tiwari, Advs.

versus

TATA PROJECTS LIMITED & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Dayan Krishnan, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Raj Shekhar Rao, Sr. Adv. along with Mr. Gaurav Sharma and Ms. Naina Agarwal, Advs. for R-1.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NITIN WASUDEO SAMBRE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJNEESH KUMAR GUPTA

ORDER

%

08.12.2025

1. In view of the objection on the point of lack of territorial jurisdiction canvassed by *Mr. N. Venkataraman*, learned Additional Solicitor General of India, appearing for the appellant, Mr. Dayan Krishnan, learned Senior Counsel appearing for respondent, on instructions, states that he be permitted to withdraw the application preferred under *Section 9* of the *Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996* (**'Arbitration Act'**), with liberty to take recourse to such remedy, including that of taking out proceedings before the appropriate forum having territorial jurisdiction by continuing the interim protection by two weeks.

2. Learned Additional Solicitor General of India, appearing for the appellant, though have consented for grant of prayer for withdrawal of



application under Section 9 with liberty, however, has strenuously opposed the prayer for continuation of *ad-interim* relief, as according to him, once the Court has no territorial jurisdiction in the matter, there is no jurisdiction even to extend the *ad-interim* relief.

3. However, having regard to the nature of relief claimed and principle of equity, we deem it appropriate to continue the interim relief dated 19th November 2025, passed by the learned Judge dealing with the application under *Section 9* of the *Arbitration Act*, for a period of one week from today.

4. We accordingly dispose of the application of the respondent preferred under *Section 9* of the *Arbitration Act* as withdrawn for want of territorial jurisdiction.

5. We further grant liberty to the respondent to take recourse to such legal remedy as is permissible and available in law.

6. We clarify that we have not gone into the merits of the matter, and the interim relief shall automatically cease to operate the moment the period of one week expires.

7. In light of above observations, the present appeal stands disposed of.

8. Pending applications are rendered infructuous.

9. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

NITIN WASUDEO SAMBRE, J.

RAJNEESH KUMAR GUPTA, J.

DECEMBER 8, 2025/mk/ss