



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

ARB-777-2025

Date of decision : 30.01.2026

PI Industries Limited

.....Applicant

Versus

Ind-Swift Laboratories Limited and others

....Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Rohit Khanna, Advocate (arguing counsel), and
Mr. Saurabh Gautam, Advocate,
for the applicant.

Mr. Surjit Bhadu, Senior Advocate (arguing counsel), with
Mr. Veer Singh, Advocate,
for the respondents.

SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE

1. This is an application filed u/s 29A of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 ('Act of 1996' for brevity) for extension of mandate of arbitral tribunal.

2. It is submitted that vide order dated 20.04.2024 (Annexure P-15) passed by this Court in ARB-183-2024, time for making the arbitral award by three member arbitral tribunal in the arbitration proceedings was extended till 31.12.2024.

3. In the recent decision of Apex Court in **Jagdeep Chowgule Vs. Sheela Chowgule and others, Civil Appeal arising out of SLP (C) No(s). 10944-10945 of 2025, decided on 29.01.2026,** it has been held as follows :-

“23. *Nimet Resources Inc. & Anr. V. Essar Steels Ltd..*
(2009) 17 SCC 313 clarifies two propositions of enduring



relevance. First, that applications concerning conduct, continuation, termination or substitution of an arbitral mandate, whether under Section 14 or otherwise, are matters of curial supervision and must be instituted before the “Court” as statutorily defined. Second, that the jurisdiction exercised under Section 11 is limited and exhausted upon the constitution of the arbitral tribunal, leading to the appointing Court becoming functus officio thereafter. These principles apply with equal force to Section 29A. The extension of mandate or substitution of an arbitrator under Section 29A does not partake the character of “appointment” under Section 11, but is a measure designed to ensure timely conclusion of arbitration. Absence of any contextual indicia to the contrary, the expression “Court” in Section 29A must, therefore, be accorded the meaning assigned to it under Section 2(1)(e).”

4. In view of above, jurisdictional Court to decide application u/s 29A (5) of the Act of 1996 shall be in terms of expression “Court” defined in Section 2 (1) (e) read with Section 29A of the Act of 1996.
5. The parties are free to file an application before the appropriate forum.
6. Accordingly, application stands disposed of.

(SHEEL NAGU)
CHIEF JUSTICE

January 30, 2026
ndj

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