



2026:DHC:9431



\$~46

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

#

CNR No. DLHC010530712022

+

O.M.P. (COMM) 1/2023, I.A. 103/2023**SANDHYA JAIN**

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Harshi Gaur and Ms.
Roopini Nandam, Advs.

versus

HARINDER MOHAN SINGH

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Kaushal Yadav, Mr.
Nandlal Kumar Mishra, Mr.
Onkar Nath Sharma & Mr.
Ritul Tandon, Advs.**CORAM:****HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE OM PRAKASH SHUKLA****JUDGMENT(ORAL)**

%

12.10.2026**I.A. 105/2023 (for 60 days delay) in O.M.P. (COMM) 1/2023**

1. The present application has been filed by Smt. Sandhya Jain under Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, seeking condonation of delay of 60 days in filing the present petition challenging the arbitral award dated 29.07.2022¹ passed by the learned Arbitrator, Shri Kailash Nath Chaturvedi.

2. By way of the present order, this Court shall dispose of the application seeking condonation of delay filed on behalf of the petitioners, namely, Smt. Sandhya Jain in her petition under Section

¹ "impugned award" hereinafter



2026:DHC:9431



34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996², challenging the arbitral award dated 29.07.2022, corrected by the learned Arbitrator on 22.08.2022.

3. Insofar as the application filed on behalf of Smt. Sandhya Jain is concerned, the Petitioner seeks condonation of delay of 60 days in filing the petition. A perusal of the application reveals that the only explanation furnished by the petitioner is that the delay occurred due to “*certain unavoidable circumstances*”. However, no particulars whatsoever have been furnished explaining the nature of the alleged unavoidable circumstances or the reasons which prevented the Petitioner from approaching the Court within the prescribed period of limitation.

4. It is settled law that a party seeking condonation of delay must disclose sufficient cause for not approaching the Court within the prescribed period. A mere bald and vague assertion, unsupported by any specific facts or circumstances, cannot constitute sufficient cause for condonation of delay.

5. Furthermore, Section 34(3) of the Act prescribes a limitation period of three months for filing a petition challenging an arbitral award, extendable by a further period of 30 days upon sufficient cause being shown, but not thereafter. In the present case, the petitioner has sought condonation of delay of 60 days, which is beyond the maximum permissible period contemplated under Section 34(3) of the

² “Act” hereinafter



2026:DHC:9431



Act. No ground for exclusion of any period from the computation of limitation has been pleaded.

6. Accordingly, this Court finds no ground to condone the delay in filing the petition on behalf of Smt. Sandhya Jain. The application seeking condonation of delay of 60 days is, therefore, dismissed.

7. The application stands disposed of.

8. Consequently, the accompanying petition under Section 34 of the Act is also dismissed as being barred by limitation.

9. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

OM PRAKASH SHUKLA, J

OCTOBER 12, 2026/at