



\$~10

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

+ **ARB.P. 2145/2024**

TATA CAPITAL LIMITED

.....Petitioner

Through: **Mr. Nachiketa Suri, Mr. Raj Kumar
and Mr. Niteen Sinha, Advocates**

versus

SANJAY KUMAR

.....Respondent

Through: **None**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

% **17.03.2025**

1. Learned counsel for the Petitioner states that he has instructions to withdraw this petition with liberty to approach the Court having competent territorial jurisdiction.
2. He states that though in the loan agreement, which is subject matter of the dispute, the Courts at Delhi have been ascribed with exclusive jurisdiction to try any dispute; however, the agreement does not specify the seat of arbitration as Delhi. Therefore, keeping in view, the provisions of Section 16 to 20 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (CPC), the Petitioner seeks liberty to approach the Court of competent territorial jurisdiction.
3. In view of above, the petition stands dismissed as withdrawn with liberty reserved as prayed for.

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

MARCH 17, 2025/rhc