



\$~17

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
**Date of Decision: 29.05.2026**

+ O.M.P. (T) (COMM.) 24/2026

OXYZO FINANCIAL SERVICES LTD .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sameer Abhyankar,  
Mr. Rastogi and Mr. Aryan  
Srivastava, Advs.

versus

M/S TREHAN INDUSTRIES & ORS. ....Respondents

Through: None.

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

% **JUDGEMENT (ORAL)**

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 14 read with Section 15 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 seeking termination of the mandate of the learned Arbitrator and appointment of a substitute Arbitrator.

2. Learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that the learned Arbitrator, while making a declaration under Section 12(5) of the Act, has stated that the learned counsel who had appeared before the Court in the Section 11 proceedings is his second cousin, and the same has been communicated by the learned Arbitrator by way of an email dated 28.01.2026. As a result thereof, the learned Arbitrator recused himself from adjudicating the disputes as between the parties.

3. This Court notices that the Respondents have been served and despite having been granted sufficient opportunity, neither have they filed any objection to the present Petition nor have they entered appearance.



4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of Petitioner, further submits that the Respondents have not been participating in the arbitral proceedings, nor did they participate in the proceedings under Section 11 of the Act.

5. This Court notes that the Notice in the present Petition was issued on 18.03.2026 and the Respondents were duly served. Despite receipt of the said notice, the Respondents neither filed a Reply nor did they enter any appearance. This Court, therefore, finds no impediment in appointing a learned substitute Sole Arbitrator for adjudication of the disputes between the parties.

6. Material on record indicates that the value of the disputes involved in the present proceedings is stated to be approximately Rs. 25 Lakhs.

7. Accordingly, this Court hereby requests **Ms. Ankita Patnaik, Advocate (Mobile No. 9873569308)** as the learned Sole Arbitrator, to enter upon the reference as the learned substitute Sole Arbitrator and to adjudicate the disputes *inter se* the parties.

8. The learned Arbitrator shall be entitled to a fee in accordance with the Fourth Schedule of the Act or as may otherwise be agreed to between the parties and the learned Arbitrator.

9. The learned Arbitrator is also requested to file the requisite disclosure as required under Section 12 (2) of the Act within one (01) week of entering the reference.

10. The Registry is directed to send a copy of the said Order to the learned Arbitrator through all permissible modes, including through e-mail.

11. Needless to state, nothing in this Order shall be construed as an expression of opinion of this Court on the merits of the controversy



2026-DHC-4920



between the parties.

12. Accordingly, the present Petition, along with pending Application(s), if any, stands disposed of in the above terms.

**HARISH VAIDYANATHAN SHANKAR, J.**  
**MAY 29, 2026/nm/va**