



\$~77

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

CNR No. DLHC010368852026

+ **W.P.(C) 11481/2026 with CM APPL. 53118/2026**

SATYAM CATERERS PRIVATE LIMITEDPetitioner

Through: Mr. Dayan Krishnan and Mr. Anurag Ahluwalia, Sr. Advocates with Mr. Vijay Kaundal, Mr. Nitish Kant Sharma, Ms. Sapna Jha, Mr. Dipanshu Gaba, Mr. Shreedhar Kali, Ms. Radhika and Mr. Sukrit, Advocates.

versus

INDIAN RAILWAY CATERING AND TOURISM CORPORATION LIMITED & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Saurav Agrawal, Ms. Kiran Devrani, Mr. Anshuman Chowdhury, Mr. Parmeet Singh, Ms. Nikita Rathi and Ms. Samayra Adlakha, Advocates for IRCTC.
Mr. Kartik Khokhar and Mr. Ashish Sharma, Advocates for R-2.
Mr. Brijesh K. Tamber, Mr. Yashu Rustagi and Ms. Chanchala Kumari, Advocates for Indian Bank/R-5

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT BANSAL

ORDER

% **19.08.2026**

1. The present writ petition has been filed seeking quashing of the demand notice dated 25th June, 2026 issued by the respondent no.1/IRCTC raising a demand of Rs.1,74,97,100/- against the petitioner in respect of additional license fee for Train No.12839-40.

2. Mr. Dayan Krishnan, Senior Advocate appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the aforesaid demand was premised on the letters



dated 8th April, 2022 (Annexure P-2 to the writ petition) and 8th February, 2023 (Annexure P-3 to the writ petition) which have been held to be unenforceable in arbitration proceedings between another similarly placed entity and the respondent no.1/IRCTC.

3. After some hearing, Mr. Dayan Krishnan and Mr. Anurag Ahluwalia, Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner on instructions submit that the petitioner may be permitted to withdraw the present writ petition with liberty to invoke the arbitration clause under the contract.

4. Accordingly, the present writ petition is disposed of while granting liberty to the petitioner to invoke the arbitration clause in accordance with law.

5. Mr. Krishnan submits that two (2) weeks' time may be given to the petitioner to take steps towards invoking the remedy of arbitration and status quo may prevail for this period of two (2) weeks.

6. Mr. Saurabh Agrawal, counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent no.1/IRCTC submits that out of the three (3) bank guarantees, two (2) have already been invoked and encashed.

6.1. This is disputed by the counsel for the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, without going into the merits of the case, in order for the petitioner to avail remedies that may be available in law, it is directed that status quo shall be maintained for a period of two (2) weeks from today.

8. Pending application stands disposed of.

AMIT BANSAL, J

AUGUST 19, 2026

Vivek/-