$~50

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

\# **CNR No. DLHC010529712026**

\+ O.M.P.(I) (COMM.) 518/2026, I.As. 30438/2026, 30439/2026

PROJECT HOLDINGS FOURTEEN (DIFC) LIMITED .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Jayant K. Mehta, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Rohan Batra, Ms. Manjira Dasgupta, Mr. Dhruv Sethi, Mr. Saurabh Batra, Mr. Kritin Bahuguna, Ms. Masvini Jain, Advocates.

versus

JPFL FILMS PRIVATE LIMITED & ANR. .....Respondents

Through: Mr. Rajshekhar Rao, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Aditya Sikka, Ms. Onshi Jakhar, Ms. Yuganshi Singh, Ms. Aashna Chawal, Advocates for R-1.

Dr. Abhishek Manu Singhvi, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Sandeep Sethi, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Avishkar Singhvi, Mr. Aditya Ganju, Mr. Vatsal Agrawal, Ms. Shreya Sethi, Mr. Krisna Gambir, Mr. Titwik Sharma, Mr. Sahil Safdar, Advocates for R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

O R D E R

% 03.11.2026

CAV 515/2026

Since learned counsel for the caveator – respondent No.1 has entered appearance, the caveat stands discharged.

O.M.P.(I) (COMM.) 518/2026

1. By way of this petition, under Section 9 of the Arbitration and

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 04/11/2026 at 11:34:47

Conciliation Act, 1996 ["the Act"], the petitioner seeks interim measures of protection in anticipation of arbitral proceedings under a Shareholders Agreement dated 16.03.2022 ["the SHA"].

2. I have heard Mr. Rajiv Nayar, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Rajshekhar Rao, learned Senior Counsel for respondent No. 1, and Dr. Abhishek Manu Singhvi, learned Senior Counsel for respondent No. 2.

3. Learned counsel for the parties submit that the petitioner and respondent No. 2, are both shareholders in respondent No.1 – Company. All three entities are parties to the SHA. The SHA admittedly contains a dispute resolution clause [Clause 18], which provides for arbitration under the Arbitration Rules of the Singapore International Arbitration Centre ["SIAC"], with the place and seat of arbitration being in Singapore.

4. The arbitration clause has admittedly been invoked by the petitioner on 16.10.2026, but the Arbitral Tribunal is yet to be constituted.

5. Several interim measures of protection have been sought by the petitioner in this petition under Section 9 of the Act. However, as the SIAC Arbitration Rules contemplate appointment of an emergency arbitrator to hear applications for emergency interim or conservatory relief, Mr. Nayar confines the relief sought in this petition to prayer 'd' of the petition, which reads as follows:

> *"d. restrain the Company, whether acting directly or through its directors, officers, agents or any person acting on its behalf, from deleting, altering, suppressing, destroying, concealing or otherwise tampering with, or impairing the integrity of, any books, records or data in the Company's possession, custody or control;"*

6. In view of the fact that the petitioner claims disclosure of certain

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 04/11/2026 at 11:34:47

financial information, Mr. Nayar submits that any intervening attempt by the respondents to delete, alter or otherwise impair the integrity of the books, records or data of respondent No. 1 would impede the interim and final reliefs which the petitioner may seek. As far as any further or other interim reliefs are concerned, whether claimed in this petition or not, Mr. Nayar submits that the petitioner be permitted to take its remedies in terms of the SIAC Rules.

7. Mr. Rao and Dr. Singhvi, on the other hand, vehemently deny any attempt on the part of either of the respondents or their officers to delete, alter or otherwise tamper with the books, records or data in the possession and control of respondent No. 1. They further submit that there is no basis for any apprehension of this sort on the part of the petitioner. They clearly state that the respondents have not engaged in any such conduct, and will not engage in any conduct referred to in prayer 'd' of the present petition.

8. In view of the aforesaid statements of learned Senior Counsel for the parties, no further orders are required in this petition.

9. The petition, alongwith all pending applications, stands disposed of in terms of the above.

10. It is made clear that all rights, contentions, and remedies of the parties before SIAC remain reserved.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

NOVEMBER 3, 2026
'*B*'/SM/

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 04/11/2026 at 11:34:47