



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

ARB-302-2025 (O&M)

ARB-303-2025 (O&M)

ARB-306-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision : 06.02.2026

Uttam Sucrotech International Pvt. Ltd.

.....Applicant

Versus

The Panipat Cooperative Sugar Mills Ltd., Panipat

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE

Present : Mr. Akshay Bhan, Senior Advocate (arguing counsel), with
Mr. Gurmohan Singh Bedi, Advocate,
Mr. Pawandeep Singh, Advocate,
Mr. Anand Vardhan Khanna, Advocate,
Mr. Akhilesh Barak, Advocate, and
Ms. Ambika Bedi, Advocate,
for the applicant.

Mr. B.S. Rana, Senior Advocate, with
Mr. Nayandeep Rana, Advocate,
for the respondent.

SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE

1. Instant applications u/s 11 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 ('1996 Act' for brevity), seek appointment of Arbitrator.
2. The rival parties herein entered into three agreements dated 08.03.2019 (Annexure P-2) in relation to establishment of a Sugar Mill project at Panipat, Haryana, namely, an Agreement for Civil Works, an Agreement for Supply Works, and an Agreement for Erection and Commissioning. Disputes are stated to have arisen out of all the three agreements. The instant



applications arising therefrom are connected and are, therefore, being dealt with together.

3. Reply filed on behalf of the respondent is taken on record and perused.

4. Agreements entered into by rival parties contain an arbitration clause, which reads as under :

“14. *ARBITRATION*

If at any time there should be any question, dispute or difference between the parties in respect of any matter arising out of or in relation to this Agreement, either party may give to the other party notice in writing of the existence of such question, dispute or difference and the same shall be referred to arbitration of a sole arbitrator. The Managing Director, Haryana State Federation of Coop. Sugar Mills Ltd., Panchkula will be the sole arbitrator. The award of the arbitrators shall be final and binding on the parties and be accepted by them.

This reference to the arbitrators shall be deemed to be a reference, under the provision of The Arbitration and Conciliation Act 1996 and the rules made there under and any statutory modifications or re-enactments thereof that may be made from time to time and actually in force at the time of reference.

The cost of arbitration shall be borne by the parties as may be decided upon by the arbitrators. Jurisdiction for arbitration will be Panchkula (Haryana).”

4.1 Dispute erupted between the parties. The applicant served notices dated 23.04.2025 (Annexure P-10) upon the respondent invoking arbitration clause and calling upon the respondent to concur but to no avail. Therefore,



applicant invoked jurisdiction of this Court for appointment of an Arbitrator by filing these applications.

4.2 It is averred that prior to invocation of arbitration, the applicant attempted to resolve the disputes through conciliation as contemplated under the said agreements; however, the said efforts did not culminate in any settlement.

5. Learned senior counsel for the respondent, could not dispute execution of arbitration agreement, exhaustion of remedy by applicant under the arbitration clause contained in the agreements between rival parties, service of notice, dispute between the parties being arbitrable and the cause not being a deadwood.

6. The law on the scope of examination u/s 11 (6) of 1996 Act is well settled. The Apex Court in **Vidya Drolia Vs. Durga Trading Corporation, (2021) 2 SCC 1** (paragraphs 154.2, 154.3 and 154.4) held that the Court may undertake a *prima facie* examination at this stage and reject an application where it is manifestly and ex facie certain that the arbitration agreement is non-existent, invalid or the disputes are non-arbitrable. In this context, the relevant extract of the said judgment is as follows :

“154.2 Scope of judicial review and jurisdiction of the Court under Sections 8 and 11 of the Arbitration Act is identical but extremely limited and restricted.

154.3 The general rule and principle, in view of the legislative mandate clear from Act 3 of 2016 and Act 33 of 2019, and the principle of severability and competence-competence, is that the Arbitral Tribunal is the preferred first authority to determine and decide all questions of non-arbitrability. The court has been conferred power of “second look” on aspects of non-arbitrability post the



award in terms of sub-clauses (i), (ii) or (iv) of Section 34 (2) (a) or sub clause (i) of Section 34 (2) (b) of the Arbitration Act.

*154.4 Rarely as a demurrer the court may interfere at Section 8 or 11 stage when it is manifestly and ex facie certain that the arbitration agreement is **non-existent, invalid or the disputes are non-arbitrable**, though the nature and facet of non-arbitrability would, to some extent, determine the level and nature of judicial scrutiny. The restricted and limited review is to check and protect parties from being forced to arbitrate when the matter is demonstrably “non arbitrable” and to cut off the deadwood. The court by default would refer the matter when contentions relating to non-arbitrability are plainly arguable; when consideration in summary proceedings would be insufficient and inconclusive; when facts are contested; when the party opposing arbitration adopts delaying tactics or impairs conduct of arbitration proceedings. This is not the stage for the court to enter into a mini trial or elaborate review so as to usurp the jurisdiction of the Arbitral Tribunal but to affirm and uphold integrity and efficacy of arbitration as an alternative dispute resolution mechanism.”*

Further, in **Vidya Darolia’s** case (supra), it was held as under :

“244. Before we part, the conclusions reached, with respect to Question 1, are :

244.1 Sections 8 and 11 of the Act have the same ambit with respect to judicial interference.

*244.2 Usually, **subject matter arbitrability cannot be decided at the stage of Section 8 or 11 of the Act, unless it is a clear case of deadwood.***

244.3 The court, under Sections 8 and 11, has to refer a matter to arbitration or to appoint an arbitrator, as the case



may be, unless a party has established a prima facie (summary findings) case of non existence of valid arbitration agreement, by summarily portraying a strong case that he is entitled to such a finding.

244.4 The court should refer a matter if the validity of the arbitration agreement cannot be determined on a prima facie basis, as laid down above i.e. “when in doubt, do refer”.

244.5 The scope of the court to examine the prima facie validity of an arbitration agreement includes only :

*244.5.1 Whether the arbitration agreement was in writing?
Or*

244.5.2 xxx xxx xxx

244.5.3 Whether the core contractual ingredients qua the arbitration agreement were fulfilled?

244.5.4 On rare occasions, whether the subject matter of dispute is arbitrable?”

7. In **NTPC Ltd. Vs. SPML Infra Ltd. (2003) 2 SCC 453**, the Apex Court while relying on the principle laid down in **Vidya Drolia** (supra) judgment, has reiterated :

“26. As general rule and a principle, the arbitral tribunal is the preferred first authority to determine and decide all questions of non-arbitrability. As an exception to the rule, and rarely as a demurrer, the referral court may reject claims which are manifestly and ex-facie non-arbitrable.”

8. Similarly, in **DLF Home Developers Ltd. Vs. Rajapura Homes (P) Ltd., (2021) 2 SCC 675**, the Apex Court reiterated that :

“19. To say it differently, this Court or a High Court, as the case may be, are not expected to act mechanically merely to deliver a purported dispute raised by an applicant at the doors of the chosen Arbitrator. On the contrary, the



Court(s) are obliged to apply their mind to the core preliminary issues, albeit, within the framework of Section 11 (6-A) of the Act. Such a review, as already clarified by this Court, is not intended to usurp the jurisdiction of the Arbitral Tribunal but is aimed at streamlining the process of arbitration. Therefore, even when an arbitration agreement exists, it would not prevent the court to decline a prayer for reference if the dispute in question does not correlate to the said agreement.”

9. It is the case of the applicant that the arbitration clause envisages appointment of a named arbitrator [i.e. Managing Director, Haryana State Federation of Cooperative Sugar Mills Ltd.] who is stated to have a direct relationship with the respondent, rendering such appointment impermissible in law. The applicant, therefore invoked jurisdiction of this Court u/s 11 (6) of 1996 Act seeking appointment of an independent arbitrator.

10. Learned senior counsel for the respondent submits that the respondent has no link with the Haryana State Federation of Cooperative Sugar Mills Ltd.

10.1 However, without expressing any opinion, this Court, to ensure fairness, deems it appropriate to appoint an independent arbitrator.

11. Pre-requisites for invoking power u/s 11 (6) of 1996 Act appear to be satisfied.

12. Accordingly, these applications are allowed.

13. Mr. Justice N.C. Jain, former Chief Justice of this Court, residing at House No. 6, Panchkula, New Address : Kothi No. 2045, Sector 21-C, Chandigarh, Mobile No. 98100 22412 and 98153 26225, is hereby appointed as Sole Arbitrator to adjudicate the disputes arising between the parties,



subject to compliance of the statutory requirements under 1996 Act before proceeding ahead.

14. Parties are directed to appear before the learned Arbitrator on date, time and place to be fixed by the Arbitrator at his convenience.

15. The Arbitrator is appointed with the liberty to determine jurisdiction, including ruling on any objections with respect to the existence or validity of the arbitration agreement and the scope of the Arbitrator’s authority in accordance with Section 16 of 1996 Act.

16. The Arbitrator shall be paid fee in accordance with the Fourth Schedule of 1996 Act, as amended from time to time, or fee as agreed to by the parties.

17. The Arbitrator is requested to complete the arbitral proceedings as per time limit stipulated u/s 29-A of 1996 Act.

18. Any observation made hereinabove is meant merely for passing this order and shall not be construed as expression on merits of the dispute.

19. A request letter along with copy of this order be sent to Mr. Justice N.C. Jain, former Chief Justice of this Court.

20. All the pending applications stand disposed of.

(SHEEL NAGU)
CHIEF JUSTICE

February 06, 2026
ndj

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No