$~8 to 14

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

\+ ARB.P. 464/2026, I.A. 7326/2026 & I.A. 7459/2026

SR DIVISIONAL COMMERCIAL MANAGER NORTHERN RAILWAYS MORADABAD UP .....Petitioner

versus

ANIL KUMAR GUPTA .....Respondent

9

\+ ARB.P. 465/2026 & I.A. 7327/2026

SR DIVISIONAL COMMERCIAL MANAGER NORTHERN RAILWAYS MORADABAD UP .....Petitioner

versus

GEETA GUPTA .....Respondent

10

\+ ARB.P. 466/2026, I.A. 7328/2026 & I.A. 7461/2026

SR DIVISIONAL COMMERCIAL MANAGER NORTHERN RAILWAYS MORADABAD UP .....Petitioner

versus

GEETA GUPTA .....Respondent

11

\+ ARB.P. 467/2026 & I.A. 7329/2026

SR DIVISIONAL COMMERCIAL MANAGER NORTHERN RAILWAYS MORADABAD UP .....Petitioner

versus

GEETA GUPTA .....Respondent

12

\+ ARB.P. 468/2026 & I.A. 7330/2026

SR DIVISIONAL COMMERCIAL MANAGER NORTHERN RAILWAYS MORADABAD UP .....Petitioner

versus

GEETA GUPTA .....Respondent

13

\+ ARB.P. 469/2026, I.A. 7331/2026 & I.A. 7462/2026

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 20/04/2026 at 11:09:32

SR DIVISIONAL COMMERCIAL MANAGER NORTHERN RAILWAYS MORADABAD UP .....Petitioner

versus

URMILA DEVI .....Respondent

14

\+ ARB.P. 470/2026, I.A. 7332/2026 & I.A. 7463/2026

SR DIVISIONAL COMMERCIAL MANAGER NORTHERN RAILWAYS MORADABAD UP .....Petitioner

versus

REETA KAPOOR .....Respondent

Appearance: Mr. Nishant Gautam, CGSC with Mr. Vineet Negi, Ms. Kavya Shukla, Mr. Vibha V Nath & Ms. Theresa, Advs. for petitioner in Item no.8 to 14.
Mr. Jitender Mehta & Mr. Lalit Kumar, Advs. for respondent in Item no.8, 13 & 14.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

O R D E R

% 10.04.2026

1. These petitions are filed under Section 11 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (for short 'the Act') for appointment of an arbitrator.

2. For the sake of convenience, the facts are being taken from ARB.P. 464/2026. A license dated 01.03.2016 was granted to the respondent for operating of a mutli purpose stall at Roorke Railway Station. The respondent consented to the revised terms consequent to the implementation of the muti purpose stall policy but failed to pay the enhanced license fee and the agreement was terminated vide letter dated 16.09.2022.

2.1 In a writ petition filed by the respondent in this Court, objection was taken by the railways that the writ is not maintainable in view of the clause 32 of the license agreement. In view of the objection raised, the respondent

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 20/04/2026 at 11:09:32

withdrew the writ petition. Vide communication dated 17.03.2023, the respondent requested the petitioner to give consent for appointment of an arbitrator named therein. The petitioner proceeded for unilateral appointment in terms of clause 32 of the license agreement dated 29.10.2015 and sought waiver from the respondent under proviso to Section 12(5) of the Act which was denied. Thereafter, the petitioner filed a petition under Section 11(6) of the Act.

3. The issue arises in this petition is as to whether this Court has territorial jurisdiction to entertain a petition under Section 11 of the Act.

4. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner on instructions seeks permission to withdraw these petitions with liberty to avail remedies in accordance with law and to approach the appropriate court.

5. These petitions are disposed of as withdrawn with liberty as prayed for.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J

APRIL 10, 2026
Ch

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 20/04/2026 at 11:09:32