



\$~98

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

+ **W.P.(C) 5010/2026**

**SWAMI SHARADDHANAND COLLEGE (UNIVERSITY OF
DELHI)**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, Advocate.

versus

NARESH KUMAR JAIN

.....Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

% **16.04.2026**

CM APPL. 24532/2026 (EXEMPTION)

1. Exemptions allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 5010/2026

3. The petition is for the following reliefs:

- a) issue a writ of Mandamus or Certiorari or writ of any other nature, order(s), direction(s) to set aside the Arbitral Award Dated 20.3.2025 Passed by Sole Arbitrator Samrat Nigam In Arbitration Case Ref No. Diac/7625/01-24 in the interest of justice;
- b) Issue such appropriate writ (s) as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper for the ends of justice; &
- c) Pass such further or other order(s) which this Hon'ble Court deems fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favor of the petitioner and against the respondents.

4. The petitioner is a college under the name Swami Shraddhanand



College, University of Delhi, Alipur, Delhi. The respondent is a sole proprietor engaged in construction activities under the name Naresh Construction Works having its office at Kanhiya Nagar, Tri Nagar, New Delhi.

5. The facts of the case would indicate that the petitioner had awarded a contract to the respondent in the year 2014 for construction, repair and renovation works at the college campus in terms of an agreement dated 21.04.2014 for a total consideration of Rs. 1.58 crores.

6. It appears that certain disputes have arisen between the parties with respect to the aforesaid contract, which led the respondent to invoke arbitration under the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996. The dispute was referred to Delhi International Arbitration Centre (**hereinafter “DIAC”**) and arbitral proceedings were initiated. During the course of arbitration, the petitioner failed to file its statement of defence within the stipulated time and was proceeded *ex parte*. Subsequently, the award dated 20.03.2025 (**hereinafter “impugned arbitral award”**) was passed allowing the respondent’s claim.

7. The sole grievance of the petitioner is that the impugned arbitral award has been passed without granting adequate opportunity to effectively defend the claim and in alleged violation of principles of natural justice.

8. The provision under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 provides a statutory mechanism for setting aside an arbitral award. The said provision empowers the competent Court to examine whether the arbitral proceedings and the award conform to the fundamental requirements of fairness, due process, and legality, and to grant appropriate relief in accordance with law.



9. The Court, thus, finds that there is no reason to entertain the instant writ petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India.
10. If the petitioner so desires may avail appropriate remedy as available in law.
11. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

APRIL 16, 2026

Aks/ss