



2025:DHC:2952



\$~89

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

Date of Decision: 22.04.2025

+ **C.R.P. 232/2023**

MEENAKSHI GOEL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Mukul Gupta, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Tushar Gupta & Ms. Parinay
Gupta, Advocates.

versus

YFC PROJECTS PRIVATE LIMITED & ORS.Respondents

Through:

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE TARA VITASTA GANJU

TARA VITASTA GANJU, J.: (Oral)

1. The present Petition seeks to challenge an order dated 05.06.2023 passed by learned District Judge, Central, Commercial-03, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi in CS(Comm) 600/2023 captioned *Meenakshi Goel v. YFC Projects Pvt. Ltd.*

2 Section 8 of the Commercial Courts Act, 2015 [hereinafter referred to as the "CC Act"] sets out that no civil revision petition shall be entertained against any interlocutory order. Section 8 of the CC Act is set out below:

"8. Bar against revision application or petition against an interlocutory order.—Notwithstanding anything contained in any other law for the time being in force, no civil revision application or petition shall be entertained against any interlocutory order of a Commercial Court, including an order on the issue of jurisdiction, and any such challenge, subject to the provisions of section 13, shall be raised only in an appeal against the decree of the Commercial Court."

3. The Division Bench of this Court in the case of ***Black Diamond***



*Track Parts (P) Ltd. v. Black Diamond Motors (P) Ltd.*¹ considered the scope of Section 8 of the CC Act and it was held that CC Act expressly bars the remedy of a revision petition filed under section 115 of Code of Civil Procedure, 1908. The relevant extract of the *Black Diamond Track Parts (P) Ltd.* case is reproduced below:

“30. The reasoning in the aforesaid judgments gave rise to the question, that since the remedy of revision under Section 115CPC though available under the CPC against the order of dismissal of application under Order 7 Rule 10CPC, has been taken away under the Commercial Courts Act, whether a petition under Article 227 would lie.

31. We are of the view that once the Commercial Courts Act has expressly barred the remedy of a revision application under Section 115CPC, with respect to the suits within its ambit, the purpose thereof cannot be permitted to be defeated by opening up the gates of Article 227 of the Constitution of India. The scope and ambit of a petition under Article 227 is much wider than the scope and ambit of a revision application under Section 115CPC; whatever can be done in exercise of powers under Section 115CPC, can also be done in exercise of powers under Article 227 of the Constitution. Allowing petitions under Article 227 to be preferred even against orders against which a revision application under Section 115CPC would have been maintainable but for the bar of Section 8 of the Commercial Courts Act, would nullify the legislative mandate of the Commercial Courts Act. Recently, in *Deep Industries Ltd. v. ONGC* [*Deep Industries Ltd. v. ONGC*(2020) 15 SCC 706] , in the context of petitions under Article 227 of the Constitution of India with respect to orders in an appeal against an order of the Arbitral Tribunal under Section 17 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, it was held that if petitions under Article 226 of 227 of the Constitution against orders passed in appeals under the Arbitration Act were entertained, the entire arbitral process would be derailed and would not come to fruition for many years. It was observed that though Article 227 is a constitutional provision which remains untouched by an non obstante Clause 5 of the Arbitration Act but what is important to note is that though petitions can be filed under Article 227 against judgments allowing or dismissing first appeals under the Arbitration Act, yet the High Court would be extremely circumspect in interfering with the same taking into account the statutory policy, so that interference is restricted to orders which are patently lacking in inherent jurisdiction. Thus, though we are of the view that gates of Article 227 ought

¹ 2021 SCC OnLine Del 3946



2025:DHC:2952



*not to be opened with respect to orders in commercial suits at the level of the District Judge against which a revision application under CPC was maintainable but which remedy has been taken away by the Commercial Courts Act, but abiding by the judgments aforesaid, hold that it cannot be said to be the law that jurisdiction under Article 227 is completely barred. **However the said jurisdiction is to be exercised very sparingly and more sparingly with respect to orders in such suits which under the CPC were revisable and which remedy has been taken away by a subsequent legislation i.e. the Commercial Courts Act, and ensuring that such exercise of jurisdiction by the High Court does not negate the legislative intent and purpose behind the Commercial Courts Act and does not come in the way of expeditious disposal of commercial suits.***

[Emphasis Supplied]

4. In view of bar in Section 8 of the CC Act, learned Senior Counsel for the Petitioner seeks to withdraw the present Petition with liberty to take appropriate steps in accordance with law.
5. The Petition is dismissed as withdraw with liberty as prayed for.
6. The parties shall act based on the digitally signed copy of the order.

TARA VITASTA GANJU, J

APRIL 22, 2025/ ha

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)