



2026:DHC:6637



\$~45

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
CNR No. DLHC010363152026
+ **O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 613/2026**
M/S SIJORI INTERNATIONAL LLP THROUGH ITS
PARTNER SAILANDER SOLANKIPetitioner
Through: Ms. Kirti Mewar, Adv.
versus
YOGESH MALIK PROPRIETOR B.S. DWARKA
.....Respondent
Through:

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE OM PRAKASH SHUKLA

ORDER(ORAL)

% **13.08.2026**

1. On 10.08.2026, this Court granted the relief sought by the Petitioner for extension of the mandate. However, before the order could be signed, it came to the notice of this Court that the value of the claim stated in paragraph 13 of the petition is Rs. 1,60,00,000/-, which is below the pecuniary jurisdiction of this Court, and therefore, the matter was listed on 12.08.2026 for clarification. The order passed on 10.08.2026 read as:

“1. The present petition has been filed under Section 29A of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 seeking extension of the mandate of the learned Sole Arbitrator, Hon'ble Mr. Justice G.S. Sistani (Retd.) by a further period of six months.

2. The learned Sole Arbitrator was appointed by this Court vide order dated 02.12.2021 passed in ARB.P. No. 1075/2021.

3. Learned Counsel appearing for the Petitioner submits that the pleadings were completed on 09.05.2022. However, the arbitral proceedings could not be concluded owing to the voluminous record arising out of the multiple transactions with the parties.

4. It is further submitted that considerable time was also consumed in exploring the possibility of an amicable settlement between the parties and, therefore, neither the parties nor the



2026:DHC:6637



learned Sole Arbitrator is at fault for the delay in concluding the arbitral proceedings.

5. *Issue notice.*

6. *Notice is accepted on behalf of the Respondent by Mr. Sudhir.*

7. *Learned Counsel appearing for the Respondent submits that the Respondent has no objection to the extension of the mandate of the learned Sole Arbitrator.*

8. *Having regard to the stage of the arbitral proceedings and the reasons stated in the petition, this Court is satisfied that sufficient cause has been made out for extension of the mandate, and that no party is at fault for the delay in concluding the arbitral proceedings.*

9. *In view of the joint request, the mandate of the learned Sole Arbitrator is extended by a further period of six months from today as a last opportunity to conclude the arbitral proceedings, which have remained pending since 2021. The intervening period till today shall also stand regularized.*

10. *The learned Sole Arbitrator shall endeavour to conclude the proceedings and render the award within the extended period.*

11. *The above order was dictated in open Court.*

12. *However, before signing the order, a perusal of the Paragraph 13 of the petition reveals that the monetary claim pending adjudication before the learned Sole Arbitrator is approximately Rs.1,60,00,000/-, which appears to be below the pecuniary jurisdiction of this Court. Paragraph 13 is reproduced hereinbelow for reference:-*

“13. That the monetary claim pending adjudication before the Ld. Sole Arbitrator is approximately Rs.1,60,00,000/-. The parties have been diligently participating in the arbitral proceedings and have already spent substantial time, effort and resources in the conduct of the same.”

13. *In view of the above, the order extending the mandate shall be kept in abeyance till the next date of hearing. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner shall satisfy this Court regarding the maintainability of the present petition before this Court on the next date of hearing.*



2026:DHC:6637



14. List on 12.08.2026 for clarification.”

2. On 12.08.2026, the Petitioner sought more time to clarify on the value of the claims pending adjudication before the learned Sole Arbitrator.

3. Today, learned Counsel for the Petitioner submits that the amount of Rs.1,60,00,000/- as stated in paragraph 13 of the petition pertains to only one claim and not the aggregate value of the claims.

4. However, she does not have the requisite documents with her today to support her statement and, therefore, seeks further time to place the relevant documents on record and satisfy this Court with regard to its pecuniary jurisdiction.

5. After some hearing, learned Counsel for the Petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the present petition, with liberty to file a fresh petition, along with the requisite documents, before this Court or before any other appropriate forum in accordance with law.

6. Leave and liberty, as prayed for, are granted.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed as withdrawn with the aforesaid liberty.

OM PRAKASH SHUKLA, J

AUGUST 13, 2026/gunn