



\$~55

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

+ **O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 1050/2025 & I.A. 32281/2025**

KIRAN CHAWLA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. C. M Maini, Mr. Mayank Maini,
Mr. Biman Sethi, Mr. Ankit Verma,
Ms. Pratima Nasa and Ms. Nidhi
Tyagi, Advs.

versus

M/S CONNECTEL SECURITIES SYSTEMS PVT. LTD. & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Vineet Pandey, Advocate

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD

ORDER

% **23.12.2025**

I.A. 32282/2025 (Exemption)

Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 1050/2025

1. The present petition under Section 29A (4) & (5) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 has been filed by the Petitioner for extending the mandate of the Arbitral Tribunal.
2. Material on record indicates that an Arbitral Tribunal was constituted by the DIAC as directed by this Court *vide* Order dated 09.11.2023 in ARB.P.804/2023. The pleadings were completed on 15.05.2024 and the one year prescribed under Section 29A(1) got over on 14.05.2025. In the meanwhile an interim Award was passed by the Arbitrator on 02.08.2024 on the basis of consent of both the parties.
3. During the pendency of the arbitration proceedings, the Arbitrator



appointed by the DIAC as directed by this Court withdrew on 21.05.2025 and a Substitute Arbitrator was appointed on 04.06.2025. *Vide* its Order dated 18.06.2025, the Arbitral Tribunal, in terms of Section 29A(1) and with the mutual consent of the parties extended its mandate by a period of six months. The said extension was effective from 15.05.2025 and got over on 15.11.2025.

4. It is stated that the cross-examination of the witnesses of the Petitioner is over and the cross-examination of the witnesses of Respondents is yet to commence.

5. Learned Counsel for the Respondents has informed this Court that an application under Section 18 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 has been moved by them before the learned Arbitrator.

6. The Apex Court in Rohan Builders (India) Private Limited v. Berger Paints India Limited, **2024 SCC OnLine SC 2494**, has held that an application for extension of the time period for passing an arbitral award under Section 29A (4) read with Section 29A(5) is maintainable even after the expiry of the twelve-month or the extended six-month period, as the case may be.

7. In view of the facts of the present case, this Court is inclined to regularize the period from 15.11.2025 till today and extend the mandate of the Arbitral Tribunal till 31.10.2026, so that the award can be pronounced.

8. The petition is disposed of, along with the pending applications, if any.

SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD, J

DECEMBER 23, 2025

Prateek