



2026:DHC:4902



\$~19

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

Date of decision: 29.05.2026

+ O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 430/2026 & I.A. 15578/2026 (EX.)

JOINT VENTURE OF BGS SGS SOMAPetitioner

Through: Appearance not given

versus

NHPC LTDRespondent

Through: Mr. Damandeep Singh Bhalla,
Ms. Surabhi Sharma and Ms.
Renu Sharma, Advocates

**CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH VAIDYANATHAN
SHANKAR**

JUDGEMENT (Oral)

1. The present Petition, under Section 29(A) (4) and (5) of the **Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996**¹, has been filed seeking an extension of the time of the mandate of the learned **three-member Arbitral Tribunal**², up to 11.09.2026.

2. Material on record indicates that the parties entered into an **Agreement dated 16.01.2004**³. Subsequently, since disputes arose between the parties, the learned Arbitral Tribunal was constituted to adjudicate the dispute as between the parties.

3. It is stated that the pleadings in the arbitral proceedings were

¹ Act

² Arbitral Tribunal

³ Agreement



2026:DHC:4902



completed in July, 2022. Thereafter, the mandate of the learned Arbitral Tribunal was extended by mutual consent of the parties for a further period of six (06) months till 03.02.2023. Subsequently, further extensions of the mandate were obtained from this Court from time to time. It is further stated that the arbitral proceedings have since concluded, and the matter presently stands at the stage of pronouncement of the Award.

4. Accordingly, it is submitted that *vide* Order dated 17.01.2023, a learned Sole Arbitrator was appointed. Subsequently, the pleadings were completed on 25.07.2024. Thereafter, evidence has been led by the parties, and presently, the arbitral proceedings are at the stage of final arguments.

5. In terms of Section 29A(1) of the Act, the arbitral award was required to be rendered within the statutorily prescribed period. Upon expiry thereof, the parties approached this Court by way of O.M.P. (Misc.) (Comm.) No. 225/2023 and thereafter O.M.P. (Misc.) (Comm.) No. 605/2024, seeking extension of the mandate of the learned Arbitral Tribunal.

6. This Court, *vide* Order dated 06.09.2023 and 13.08.2024 in the aforesaid Petitions, extended the mandate of the learned Arbitral Tribunal till 12.09.2025.

7. It is stated that although the arbitral proceedings stand concluded and the matter has been reserved for the pronouncement of the Award, the Award could not be rendered within the extended period of mandate; therefore, it is prayed that the mandate be extended till 11.09.2026.

8. Learned counsel for the Respondent, who is appearing on



2026:DHC:4902



advance service, on instructions submits that he has no objection to the relief as sought in the present Petition.

9. This Court has heard learned counsel for both parties and perused the record of the present Petition.

10. This Court is of the view that, in the interest of justice, to ensure continuity and consistency, and since both the parties are *ad idem* for the said extension, there is no impediment in the grant of relief as sought for.

11. At this juncture, it is apposite to note the relevant statutory provision. Section 29-A of the Act prescribes the timeline for making an arbitral award and stipulates the consequences of non-compliance. For clarity, Section 29-A of the Act is reproduced below:

“29-A. Time limit for arbitral award.— [(1) The award in matters other than international commercial arbitration shall be made by the arbitral tribunal within a period of twelve months from the date of completion of pleadings under sub-section (4) of Section 23;

(2) If the award is made within a period of six months from the date the arbitral tribunal enters upon the reference, the arbitral tribunal shall be entitled to receive such amount of additional fees as the parties may agree.

(3) The parties may, by consent, extend the period specified in sub-section (1) for making award for a further period not exceeding six months.

(4) If the award is not made within the period specified in sub-section (1) or the extended period specified under sub-section (3), the mandate of the arbitrator(s) shall terminate unless the court has, either prior to or after the expiry of the period so specified, extended the period: Provided that while extending the period under this sub-section, if the court finds that the proceedings have been delayed for the reasons attributable to the arbitral tribunal, then, it may order reduction of fees of arbitrator(s) by not exceeding five per cent for each month of such delay: [Provided further that where an application under sub-section (5) is pending, the mandate of the arbitrator shall continue till the disposal of the said application: Provided also that the arbitrator shall be given an opportunity of being heard before the fees is reduced.]

(5) The extension of period referred to in sub-section (4) may be on the application of any of the parties and may be granted only for sufficient cause and on such terms and conditions as may be imposed by the Court.



2026:DHC:4902



(6) While extending the period referred to in sub-section (4), it shall be open to the Court to substitute one or all of the arbitrators and if one or all of the arbitrators are substituted, the arbitral proceedings shall continue from the stage already reached and on the basis of the evidence and material already on record, and the arbitrator(s) appointed under this section shall be deemed to have received the said evidence and material.

(7) In the event of arbitrator(s) being appointed under this section, the arbitral tribunal thus reconstituted shall be deemed to be in continuation of the previously appointed arbitral tribunal.

(8) It shall be open to the Court to impose actual or exemplary costs upon any of the parties under this section.

(9) An application filed under sub-section (5) shall be disposed of by the Court as expeditiously as possible and endeavour shall be made to dispose of the matter within a period of sixty days from the date of service of notice on the opposite party.”

12. The Hon’ble Supreme Court, in *Rohan Builders (India) Private Limited v. Berger Paints India Limited*⁴, examined Section 29-A in detail and clarified its scope, ambit, and mandate thereof.

13. In view of the foregoing discussion, the law laid down by the Hon’ble Supreme Court and the facts of the present case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the present Petition ought to be allowed.

14. Accordingly, the mandate of the learned Sole Arbitrator is extended for a further period of three months, i.e., till 11.09.2026.

15. Accordingly, the present Petition, along with pending Application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

HARISH VAIDYANATHAN SHANKAR, J.
MAY 29, 2026/rk/jk/kv

⁴ 2024 SCC OnLine SC 2494