

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 4440 OF 2026

Team Universal Infratech Pvt. Ltd.

..Petitioner

Versus

Moraj Infratech Pvt. Ltd.

...Respondent

WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 2698 OF 2026
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 4440 OF 2026

Mr. Venktesh Dhond, Senior Advocate, Mr. Shashwat Singh Sawno, Mr. Himanshu Dubey (through VC), Mr. Tanmay Joshi, Mr. Abhiraj Rao, Mr. Rishabh Chouhan, Ms. Stuti Singh, Ms. Ankita Sinha (through VC), for the Petitioner.

Mr. Nikhil Sakhardande, Senior Advocate, Mr. Farid Karachiwala, Mr. Yuvraj Choksy i/b. J Sagar Associates, for the Respondent .

CORAM : N. J. JAMADAR, J.

DATE : 7th APRIL 2026

P.C.:

1. Heard the learned Counsel for the parties.
2. The challenge in this petition is to an order dated 31st March, 2026, passed by the learned Sole Arbitrator on an application preferred by the petitioner/respondent in the arbitral proceedings to disallow/reject six of the documents which are annexed as exhibits to the report of the expert, who is examined as CW-2 for the claimant.

3. Mr. Dhond, the learned Senior Advocate for the petitioner submitted that, the learned Sole Arbitrator ought to have decided the issue of the permissibility of the production of the documents, at this stage. The learned Arbitrator has ruled that, the issues of admissibility, relevancy, materiality and credibility of the report only shall be open for determination. However, the objections raised by the petitioner as to the very admissibility of the documents have not been decided.

4. In opposition to this, Mr. Sakhardande, the learned Senior Advocate for the respondent submitted that, the petition against an order of the present nature, passed by the learned Arbitrator, is not at all maintainable, as the learned Arbitrator is empowered to conduct the proceeding in the manner it considers appropriate.

5. Having considered the submissions on behalf of the parties and the nature of the order impugned in this petition, in exercise of the writ jurisdiction, this Court is not inclined to entertain the petition as it cannot be said that, the perversity of the impugned order stares in the face. Even otherwise, the observations in Paragraph No. 6 of the impugned order would indicate that, the learned Arbitrator has kept the option open for the respondent/petitioner herein, to raise objections to the

admissibility of the documents, when the documents are sought to be proved during the course of the examination-in-chief of CW-2.

6. Thus, with the aforesaid clarification, the Writ Petition stands disposed.

7. In view of the disposal of petition, the Interim Application also stands disposed.

[N. J. JAMADAR, J.]