



\$~22, 23, 35 & 36

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

+ O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 1021/2025 & I.A. 31477/2025 (Ex.
From filing certified copies of dim annexures)

M/S SHARDA DEVELOPERS

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Roshan Santhalia,
Mr.Shivansh Sinha, Advocates

versus

M/S AGARWAL ASSOCIATES (PROMOTERS) LIMITED

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Divyakant Lahoti,
Ms.Akanksha Soni and Ms.
Shubheksha Dwivedi,
Advocates

23

+ O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 1022/2025 & I.A. 31482/2025 (Ex.
From filing certified copies of dim annexures)

M/S SHARDA DEVELOPERS

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Roshan Santhalia,
Mr.Shivansh Sinha, Advocates

versus

M/S AGARWAL ASSOCIATES (PROMOTOR) LIMITED

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Divyakant Lahoti,
Ms.Akanksha Soni and Ms.
Shubheksha Dwivedi,
Advocates

35

+ O.M.P. (MISC.)(COMM) 22/2026

M/S AGARWAL ASSOCIATES PROMOTERS LIMITED

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Divyakant Lahoti,



Ms.Akanksha Soni and Ms.
Shubheksha Dwivedi,
Advocates

versus

M/S SHARDA DEVELOPERS THROUGH ITS
PROPRIETOR

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Roshan Santhalia,
Mr.Shivansh Sinha, Advocates

36

+ O.M.P. (MISC.)(COMM) 23/2026

M/S AGARWAL ASSOCIATES PROMOTERS LIMITED

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Divyakant Lahoti,
Ms.Akanksha Soni and Ms.
Shubheksha Dwivedi,
Advocates

versus

M/S SHARDA DEVELOPERS THROUGH ITS
PROPRIETOR

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Roshan Santhalia,
Mr.Shivansh Sinha, Advocates

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH VAIDYANATHAN
SHANKAR

ORDER
08.01.2026

%

1. O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) Nos. 1021/2025 and 1022/2025 have been filed by **M/s Sharda Developers**, under Section 29A of the **Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996** ["Act"], seeking extension of the mandate of the learned Arbitrator for a further period of Six months.



2. O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) Nos. 22/2026 and 23/2026 have been filed by **M/s Agarwal Associates Promoters Limited**, under Section 29A(6) of the Act, seeking substitution of the learned Arbitrator.

3. The solitary ground canvassed in support of the present Applications for substitution, as well as in opposition to the extension of the mandate, is allegedly the delay in the conclusion of the Arbitral Proceedings.

4. Since the issues arising in all the aforesaid Applications are common and interconnected, with the consent of learned counsel for the parties, the matters have been heard together and are being disposed of by this common order.

O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 1021/2025 & I.A. 31477/2025
O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 1022/2025 & I.A. 31482/2025

4. These Petitions have been filed for extension of the mandate of the Arbitration which is stated to have expired on 27.12.2025.

5. Respondent has filed their reply dated 22.12.2025 opposing the prayer for extension of the mandate of the learned Arbitrator.

6. It is contended on behalf of the Respondent that, at the final stage of the Arbitral Proceedings, the learned Arbitrator allowed an Application which, according to them, is likely to further delay the conclusion of the Arbitral Proceedings.

7. It is for the above-said reason, the Respondent has sought to challenge the extension of the Ld. Arbitrator and in turn, prayed for substitution of the Ld. Arbitrator.

8. The counsel for Petitioner contends that the said Application was merely allowed by the Ld. Arbitrator in the interest of Justice and on the ground that it went to the very root of the matter.



9. This Court is of the considered view that, at this stage of the proceedings, particularly when the Arbitral Proceedings are nearing completion, substitution of the learned Arbitrator would not be practical or conducive to the expeditious disposal of the dispute.

10. In these circumstances, considering the spirit and object of the Act, it is deemed appropriate to fix a timeline for conclusion of the Arbitral Proceedings.

11. Accordingly, the mandate of the learned Arbitrator is extended for a further period of Four months from today. The learned Arbitrator is requested to expedite the matter.

12. With the aforesaid directions, O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) Nos. 1021/2025 and 1022/2025, along with all pending Application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 22/2026

O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 23/2026

12. In view of the findings recorded hereinabove and the extension of the mandate of the learned Arbitrator, no case for substitution is made out.

13. Accordingly, O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) Nos. 22/2026 and 23/2026, along with all pending Application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

14. A photocopy of this Order be placed in the connected matters.

HARISH VAIDYANATHAN SHANKAR, J.
JANUARY 8, 2026/rk/kr