



\$~69

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

+ **OMP (ENF.) (COMM.) 48/2026, EX.APPL.(OS) 313/2026**

MINTELLECTUALS LLP

.....Decree Holder

Through: Mr. Samrat Nigam, Sr. Adv., Mr.
Pranav Jain, Ms. Arpita Rawat, Mr.
Tanish Manuja, Advs.

versus

LAVA INTERNATIONAL LIMITED

.....Judgement Debtor

Through: Mr. Abhay Raj Varma and Mr. Arjun
Rekhi, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD

ORDER

19.03.2026

%

1. The present Petition has been filed for execution of the Judgment dated 24.02.2026, passed by this Court in O.M.P.(I) (COMM.) 15/2026, directing the Respondent herein to furnish a Bank Guarantee for Rs. 43.091 Crores and to deposit the same with the Registrar General of this Court.
2. The said Order was challenged by the Respondent herein by filing FAO(OS) (COMM) 65/2026 wherein the learned Counsel for the Respondent herein informed the Division Bench that the Respondent had filed an Application under Section 33 of the Arbitration Act and the principal amount of the award has been reduced from Rs.127.856 crores to Rs.45.81 crores. *Vide* Order dated 19.03.2026, the Division Bench of this Court has disposed of FAO(OS) (COMM) 65/2026, by passing the following Order:



“1. Learned counsel for the appellant informed that pursuant to the order dated 18.03.2026 passed under Section 33 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (hereinafter referred to as ‘the Act of 1996’), the principal amount of the award which was earlier Rs.127.856 crores has now been reduced to Rs.45.81 crores.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant argued that such being the position, the stipulation made in para No. 41 of the impugned order dated 24.02.2026 needs to be modified.

3. While submitting that he has to lay challenge to the subsequent order dated 18.03.2026 as well, on the grounds or reasons which are available to the appellant, learned counsel prayed for two weeks’ time to place the same on record and amend the appeal.

4. Mr. Samrat Nigam, learned Senior Counsel for the respondent fairly accepted that as a necessary corollary of the order dated 18.03.2026, para No. 41 of the order dated 24.02.2026 shall require suitable modification. He submitted that he will have no objection if the appellant goes before the learned Single Judge and seeks such modification and until such modification is made, he shall instruct his client not to pursue the execution.

5. Having considered the fair stand of the respondent, we are of the view that no fruitful purpose would be served by requiring the appellant to go back to the learned Single Judge for such modification.

6. According to us since by dint of subsequent order dated 18.03.2026, the original award dated 24.02.2026 has been substantially modified, the grounds which have been raised in the present appeal may not be



relevant and for that purpose the appellant may be required to challenge the same either under Section 34 of the Act of 1996 before learned Single Judge or otherwise as advised to him.

7. We, therefore, dispose of the present appeal and modify the order dated 24.02.2026 more particularly para No. 41 thereof, in the manner that the appellant shall not be required to furnish bank guarantee for the balance amount (Rs. 43.091 crores) as mentioned in para No.41 of the impugned order.

8. The appeal stands disposed of accordingly, alongwith pending application(s).”

3. Since the amount already stands deposited with this Court in compliance with the earlier Orders, the present Petition has become infructuous and is disposed of as such, along with pending application(s), if any.

SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD, J

MARCH 19, 2026

S. Zakir