

ORDER SHEET

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
COMMERCIAL DIVISION
ORIGINAL SIDE

AP-COM/220/2026

SREI EQUIPMENT FINANCE LIMITED
VS
MIDEAST INTEGRATED STEELS LIMITED

BEFORE:

The Hon'ble JUSTICE GAURANG KANTH

Date : 8th April, 2026.

Appearance:

Mr. Swatarup Banerjee, Adv.
Mr. Paritosh Sinha, Adv.
Mr. Sariful Haque, Adv.
Mr. Saubhik Chowdhury, Adv.
Ms. Suchisattwa Mallick, Adv.
...for the petitioner

Mr. Rohit Mukherji, Adv.
Mr. Pankaj Agarwal, Adv.
Ms. Champa Pal, Adv.
...for the respondent

The Court: The petitioner has preferred the present petition under Section 29A of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, seeking extension of the mandate of the Arbitral Tribunal for conclusion of the arbitral proceedings and publication of the arbitral award.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that vide order dated 22.02.2023 appointed the sole Arbitrator to adjudicate the disputes between the parties. The Arbitral Tribunal vide order dated 01.04.2024 closed the respondent's right to file Statement of Defence. The respondent preferred O.S. 2556 of 2024 challenging the order dated 01.04.2024. This Court vide

order dated 24.01.2025 allowed the respondent to file its Statement of Defence. In view thereof, the respondent filed the Statement of Defence dated 24.01.2025. On expiry of one year i.e., 25.01.2026, the Tribunal requested the parties to give consent for the extension of the mandate. However, learned Counsel for the respondent had refused the said extension compelling the petitioner to file the present petition.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner states that the Tribunal has already conducted more than 42 hearings and now the matter is at the stage of recording of evidence.

Learned Counsel for the respondent states that he has no reason to oppose the extension of the mandate of the Arbitral Tribunal but will not consent to any of the submissions made in the present petition to be admitted.

Upon consideration of the submissions of both the parties and the materials placed on record, this Court is satisfied that there has been no undue or unwarranted delay on the part of the learned sole Arbitrator in conducting the proceedings.

Having regard to the stage of the proceedings and in the interest of justice, the mandate of the learned sole Arbitrator is extended further for a period of six months from today.

The learned sole Arbitrator is requested to make all reasonable endeavours to conclude the arbitral proceedings and publish the arbitral award within the extended time period.

Since affidavits have not been exchanged, none of the contentions are deemed to be admitted.

With the aforesaid observations, the present petition stands disposed of.

(GAURANG KANTH, J.)

R.Bhar