$-6

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

\+ **ARB.P. 621/2025**

Date of Decision**: 22.11.2025**

IN THE MATTER OF:

MANISH GUPTA
S/O LATE SH. RAMESH CHANDRA GUPTA
ADDRESS: MADHAV NAGAR, GWALIOR
MADHYA PRADESH- 474002

..... PETITIONER

Through: Mr. Shubham Budhiraja, Mr. Sanjeev Chaudhary and Mr. Shubham Prateek, Advocates.

Versus

M/S ORIENTAL QUARRIES AND MINES PRIVATE LIMITED
THROUGH ITS AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE
ADDRESS: OSE COMMERCIAL BLOCK,
HOTEL ALOFT, ASSETS- 5B, HOSPITALITY
DISTRICT, IGI AIRPORT, SOUTH WEST
DELHI, DELHI-110037 .....Respondent

Through: Mr. Nitesh Jain, Mr. Nishant Bhargava and Ms. Anushka Singh, Advocates.

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

JUDGEMENT

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 11(6) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (hereinafter "**the Act**"), seeking

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:NEHA CHOPRA
Signing Date:26.11.2025
13:16:35

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

appointment of an Arbitrator to adjudicate upon the disputes that have arisen between the parties under Lease Agreement dated 20.06.2012 (hereinafter "**the Agreement**").

2. The case set up by the petitioner is that he is the absolute and sole owner of the land bearing survey no.3707/3/4/5/8/10/11/ measuring 23 Bigha situated at Bilaua Village, Dabra Tehsil, Gwalior District, Madhya Pradesh, and had leased the said property to the respondent *vide* the Agreement for a period of ten years (120 months) commencing from 16/05/2012 till 15/05/2022. The petitioner claims that the respondent defaulted in payment of the rentals from March, 2020. However, upon assurances from the respondent that all outstanding dues would be cleared, the lease was extended for a period of two years i.e., from 16.05.2022 till 15.05.2024. The respondent is alleged, neither to have cleared the dues, nor paid the rental amounts subsequently. Subsequently, the petitioner has issued legal notice dated 22.07.2024 to the respondent terminating the lease and demanding clearance of outstanding dues. However, the aforesaid demand was not accepted by the respondent, leading to the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the respondent, opposes the petition and contends that the claim is time barred and the Agreement itself is invalid. He has also raised various other objections on the merits of the claim.

4. The Court takes note of Clause 38 of the Agreement, which is extracted below, for reference:-

> *"38) All dispute or differences whatsoever arising between the parties out of, relating to the construction, meaning and operation or effect of this*

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:NEHA CHOPRA
Signing Date:26.11.2025 13:16:35

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

agreement or the breach thereof shall be settled in following manners:

> *(i) All disputes shall be referred and settled through an arbitration procedure as per arbitration and conciliation act, 1996. The parties shall notify in writing their intention to commence arbitration. Such notice shall establish the entitlement of the party giving the same to commence arbitration.*
>
> *(iii) Within 30 days from the date of receipt of the notice for intention to commence arbitration by other party, the parties will agreed upon sole arbitrator, to be appointed by the managing director of Second party, failing which the appointment shall be as per the provision of arbitration and conciliation act, 1996. The courts of Delhi shall have the exclusive jurisdiction. The arbitration shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of arbitration and conciliation act, 1996 and the award made in pursuance thereof shall be binding on the parties. The venue of arbitration shall be New Delhi only."*

5. The law with respect to the scope and standard of judicial scrutiny under Section 11(6) of the Act has been fairly well settled. This Court in ***Pradhaan Air Express Pvt Ltd v. Air Works India Engineering Pvt Ltd***[1] has extensively dealt with the scope of interference at the stage of Section 11 of the Act. Furthermore, this Court, in ***Axis Finance Limited Vs. Mr. Agam Ishwar Trimbak***[2] has held that the scope of inquiry under Section 11 of the Act is limited to a *prima facie* examination of the *existence* of an arbitration agreement. Further, it was also reiterated that objections relating to the arbitrability of disputes are not to be entertained by a referral Court acting under Section 8 or 11 of the Act. The relevant extract of the aforesaid decision reads as under: -

> *"19.In In Re: Interplay , the Supreme Court confined the analysis under Section 11 of the Act to the existence of an arbitration agreement and*

[1] 2025 SCC OnLine Del 3022
[2] 2025:DHC:7477

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:NEHA CHOPRA
Signing Date:26.11.2025 13:16:35

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

under Section 8 of the Act to the existence and validity of an arbitration agreement. Under both the provisions, examination was to be made at the touchstone of Section 7 of the Act. Further, issues pertaining to the arbitrability of the dispute fell outside the scope of both Section 11(6A) and Section 8 of the Act. The material part of the judgement of the Supreme Court in In Re: Interplay reads as under:

> *164. The 2015 Amendment Act has laid down different parameters for judicial review under Section 8 and Section 11. Where Section 8 requires the referral Court to look into the prima facie existence of a valid arbitration agreement. Section 11 confines the Court's jurisdiction to the examination of the existence of an arbitration agreement. Although the object and purpose behind both Sections 8 and 11 is to compel parties to abide by their contractual understanding, the scope of power of the referral Courts under the said provisions is intended to be different. The same is also evident from the fact that Section 37 of the Arbitration Act allows an appeal from the order of an arbitral tribunal refusing to refer the parties to arbitration under Section 8, but not from Section 11. Thus, the 2015 Amendment Act has legislatively overruled the dictum of Patel Engineering (supra) where it was held that Section 8 and Section 11 are complementary in nature. Accordingly, the two provisions cannot be read as laying down a similar standard. 165. The legislature confined the scope of reference under Section 11(6A) to the examination of the existence of an arbitration agreement. The use of the term "examination" in itself connotes that the scope of the power is limited to a prima facie determination. Since the Arbitration Act is a self-contained code, the requirement of "existence" of an arbitration agreement draws effect from Section 7 of the Arbitration Act. In Duro Felguera (supra), this Court held that the referral Courts only need to consider one aspect to determine the existence of an arbitration agreement – whether the underlying contract contains an arbitration agreement which provides for arbitration pertaining to the disputes which have arisen between the parties to the agreement. Therefore, the scope of examination under Section 11(6A) should be confined to the existence of an arbitration agreement on the basis of Section 7Similarly, the validity of an arbitration agreement, in view of Section 7, should be restricted to the requirement of formal validity such as the requirement that the agreement be in writing. This interpretation also gives true effect to the doctrine of competence-competence by leaving the issue of substantive existence and validity of an arbitration agreement to be decided by arbitral tribunal under Section 16. We accordingly*

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:NEHA CHOPRA
Signing Date:26.11.2025 13:16:35

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

clarify the position of law laid down in Vidya Drolia (supra) in the context of Section 8 and Section 11 of the Arbitration Act. 166. The burden of proving the existence of arbitration agreement generally lies on the party seeking to rely on such agreement. In jurisdictions such as India, which accept the doctrine of competencecompetence, only prima facie proof of the existence of an arbitration agreement must be adduced before the referral Court. The referral Court is not the appropriate forum to conduct a minitrial by allowing the parties to adduce the evidence in regard to the existence or validity of an arbitration agreement. The determination of the existence and validity of an arbitration agreement on the basis of evidence ought to be left to the arbitral tribunal. This position of law can also be gauged from the plain language of the statute. 167. Section 11(6A) uses the expression "examination of the existence of an arbitration agreement." The purport of using the word "examination" connotes that the legislature intends that the referral Court has to inspect or scrutinize the dealings between the parties for the existence of an arbitration agreement. Moreover, the expression "examination" does not connote or imply a laborious or contested inquiry. On the other hand, Section 16 provides that the arbitral tribunal can "rule" on its jurisdiction, including the existence and validity of an arbitration agreement. A "ruling" connotes adjudication of disputes after admitting evidence from the parties. Therefore, it is evident that the referral Court is only required to examine the existence of arbitration agreements, whereas the arbitral tribunal ought to rule on its jurisdiction, including the issues pertaining to the existence and validity of an arbitration agreement. A similar view was adopted by this Court in Shin-Etsu Chemical Co. Ltd. v. Aksh Optifibre Ltd." [Emphasis supplied]

20. The effect of In Re: Interplay was further explained by a Three Judge Bench of the Supreme Court in SBI General Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Krish Spinning[3] *wherein the Court declared Vidya Drolia and NTPC Ltd.'s findings qua scope of inquiry under Section 8 and Section 11 of the Act to no longer be compatible with modern principles of arbitration. The material portions of the judgement read as under:*

"114. In view of the observations made by this Court in In Re : Interplay (supra), it is clear that the scope of enquiry at the stage of appointment of arbitrator is limited to the scrutiny of prima facie existence of the arbitration agreement, and nothing else.

[3] 2024 SCC OnLine SC 1754

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:NEHA CHOPRA
Signing Date:26.11.2025 13:16:35

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

For this reason, we find it difficult to hold that the observations made in Vidya Drolia (supra) and adopted in NTPC v. SPML (supra) that the jurisdiction of the referral Court when dealing with the issue of "accord and satisfaction" under Section 11 extends to weeding out ex-facie non-arbitrable and frivolous disputes would continue to apply despite the subsequent decision in In Re : Interplay (supra). ... 118. Tests like the "eye of the needle" and "ex-facie meritless", although try to minimise the extent of judicial interference, yet they require the referral Court to examine contested facts and appreciate prima facie evidence (however limited the scope of enquiry may be) and thus are not in conformity with the principles of modern arbitration which place arbitral autonomy and judicial non-interference on the highest pedestal." [Emphasis supplied]

21. Similarly, in BGM and M-RPL-JMCT (JV) v. Eastern Coalfields Ltd[4] *the Supreme Court succinctly explained the effect of In Re: Interplay on a Referral Court's powers under Section 11 of the Act. The relevant part of the judgement is as under:*

15. ...

(a) Section 11 confines the Court's jurisdiction to the examination regarding the existence of an arbitration agreement.

(b) The use of the term "examination" in itself connotes that the scope of the power is limited to a prima facie determination.

(c) Referral Courts only need to consider one aspect to determine the existence of an arbitration agreement — whether the underlying contract contains an arbitration agreement which provides for arbitration pertaining to the disputes which have arisen between the parties to the agreement. Therefore, the scope of examination under Section 11(6-A) should be confined to the existence of an arbitration agreement on the basis of Section 7. Such a legal approach will help the Referral Court in weeding out prima facie non-existent arbitration agreements.

(d) The purport of using the word "examination" connotes that the legislature intends that the Referral Court has to inspect or scrutinise the dealings between the parties for the existence of an arbitration agreement. However, the expression "examination" does not connote or imply a laborious or contested inquiry.

(e) The burden of proving the existence of arbitration agreement generally lies on the party seeking to rely on such agreement.

[4] 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1471

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:NEHA CHOPRA
Signing Date:26.11.2025 13:16:35

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

> *Only prima facie proof of the existence of an arbitration agreement must be adduced before the Referral Court. The Referral Court is not the appropriate forum to conduct a mini-trial by allowing the parties to adduce the evidence in regard to the existence or validity of an arbitration agreement. The determination of the existence and validity of an arbitration agreement on the basis of evidence ought to be left to the Arbitral Tribunal.*
>
> *(f) Section 16 provides that the Arbitral Tribunal can "rule" on its jurisdiction, including the existence and validity of an arbitration agreement. A "ruling" connotes adjudication of disputes after admitting evidence from the parties. Therefore, when the Referral Court renders a prima facie opinion, neither the Arbitral Tribunal, nor the Court enforcing the arbitral award is bound by such a prima facie view. If a prima facie view as to the existence of an arbitration agreement is taken by the Referral Court, it still allows the Arbitral Tribunal to examine the issue in depth.*
>
> *[Emphasis supplied]*
>
> *22. Thus from the above-mentioned authorities it is clear that a Court's scope of inquiry under Section 11 of the Act has been limited to a prima facie examination of the existence of an arbitration agreement while the adjudication under Section 8 is to be made for both existence and validity. Further, the examination so undertaken under both the said provisions must be within the confines of Section 7 of the Act. Objections relating to arbitrability of disputes are not to be entertained by a referral Court acting under Section 8 or 11 of the Act."*

9. Considering the aforenoted position of law, the objections raised on behalf of the respondents, are not required to be considered in the present proceedings, and may be looked into by the Sole Arbitrator.

10. In view of the fact that disputes have arisen between the parties and there is an arbitration clause in the Agreement, Mr. Siddharth Sharma, Advocate (Mobile No. (+91 7400111111, e-mail id: siddharthsharma047@gmail.com) is appointed as the Sole Arbitrator.

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:NEHA CHOPRA
Signing Date:26.11.2025 13:16:35

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

11. The arbitration would take place under the aegis of the Delhi International Arbitration Centre (DIAC) and would abide by its rules and regulations. The learned Arbitrator shall be entitled to fees as per the Schedule of Fees maintained by the DIAC.

12. The learned arbitrator is also requested to file the requisite disclosure under Section 12 (2) of the Act within a week of entering on reference.

13. The Registry is directed to send a receipt of this order to the learned arbitrator through all permissible modes, including through e-mail.

14. All rights and contentions of the parties in relation to the claims/counter-claims are kept open, to be decided by the learned Arbitrator on their merits, in accordance with law, and nothing in this order shall be construed as an expression of opinion of this Court on the merits of the controversy between the parties..

15. Accordingly, the instant petition stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J

NOVEMBER 22, 2025
Nc/amg

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:NEHA CHOPRA
Signing Date:26.11.2025
13:16:35

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV