



2025:DHC:10227-DB



\$~64

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

*Date of decision: 19.11.2025*

+ **FAO (COMM) 327/2025**

**DR BABA SAHEB AMBEDKAR HOSPITAL (GNCTD)**

.....Appellant

Through: Mr.S. K. Sangwan, Adv.

versus

**M/S INNOVISION LIMITED**

.....Respondent

Through:

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA**

**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MADHU JAIN**

**NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)**

**CM APPL. 72439/2025 (Exemption)**

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

**CM APPL. 72440/2025**

2. This application seeks condonation of 71 days' delay in re-filing the appeal.

3. For the reasons stated in the application, the delay of 71 days in re-filing the appeal is condoned.

4. The application is disposed of.

**CM APPL. 72437/2025**

5. This application has been filed by the appellant, seeking condonation of delay of 242 days in filing of the present appeal under





object of the Act and the strict timeline stipulated therein as well as under the Commercial Courts Act, 2015.

10. The Supreme Court, in ***Government of Maharashtra (Water Resources Department) Represented by Executive Engineer v. Borse Brothers Engineers and Contractors Pvt Ltd.***, (2021) 6 SCC 460, held as under: -

*“ 58. Given the object sought to be achieved under both the Arbitration Act and the Commercial Courts Act, that is, the speedy resolution of disputes, the expression “sufficient cause” is not elastic enough to cover long delays beyond the period provided by the appeal provision itself. Besides, the expression “sufficient cause” is not itself a loose panacea for the ill of pressing negligent and stale claims....*

*xxx*

*63. Given the aforesaid and the object of speedy disposal sought to be achieved both under the Arbitration Act and the Commercial Courts Act, for appeals filed under Section 37 of the Arbitration Act that are governed by Articles 116 and 117 of the Limitation Act or Section 13(1-A) of the Commercial Courts Act, a delay beyond 90 days, 30 days or 60 days, respectively, is to be condoned by way of exception and not by way of rule....”*

11. Strict timelines have been imposed in matters relating to commercial disputes, and it would defeat the legislative intent if inordinate delays are condoned by taking an overly liberal view of the expression “sufficient cause” in the context of such matters.

12. Accordingly, we find no merit in the application, and the same is dismissed.

