

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

ARBITRATION PETITION NO.9/2026

AYAN

PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

ROADZEN INC

RESPONDENT(S)

WITH

ARBITRATION PETITION NO.34/2026
&
ARBITRATION PETITION NO. 35/2026

O R D E R

1. These petitions under Section 11(6) r/w Section 11(12)(a) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (Act), seek the appointment of a sole arbitrator to adjudicate disputes arising from three Freelance Contracts dated 17.10.2022, 17.01.2023 and 17.01.2024, executed between the Petitioner(s) and the Respondent(s).
2. Since all three Freelance Contracts contain identical clauses, reference shall, for the purposes of this Order, be made to the contract executed on 17.10.2022.
3. Briefly observed, the Petitioner(s) is an Indian citizen currently residing in Germany and providing consultancy services, in product and business requirements, to the Respondent. The Respondent-company is incorporated in Delaware, USA and is involved in providing technology and strategy services to the insurance industry. By way of the three Freelance Contracts, the Respondent-company appointed the Petitioner(s) to provide consultancy services in product

and business requirements.

4. It appears that a dispute arose in 2024 when the Petitioner(s) sought payment of EUR 48,141.69 [approximately Rs. 53+ Lakhs], stated to be due to him under the three Freelance Contracts. It is alleged that the Respondent neither acceded to this request nor fulfilled its payment obligations under the said contracts. The Petitioner(s) then resigned as consultant with effect from 26.09.2024 and sought to initiate arbitral proceedings in accordance with Clause 11.2 of the Freelance Contracts.

5. Accordingly, *vide* communications dated 23.04.2025 to the Respondent, the Petitioner(s) suggested the name of two advocates for appointment as the Sole Arbitrator to adjudicate the dispute. However, the Respondent is said to have not replied to this notice. Hence, the Petitioner(s) has filed the instant Petition under Section 11(6) r/w Section 11(12)(a) of the Act.

6. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances recorded above and the relevant provision(s) under the Freelance Contract(s), we deem it just and proper to allow the instant Arbitration Petitions and appoint Ms. Iram Majid, Advocate and Director, Indian Institute of Arbitration and Mediation, as the Sole Arbitrator to resolve the disputes between the parties. The seat and venue of arbitration, in terms of the

arbitration clause in the Freelance Contract(s), shall be New Delhi, India. Ordered accordingly.

8. The Arbitrator shall have the liberty to fix her own remuneration/fees.

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

.....CJI.
(SURYA KANT)

.....J.
(JOYMALYA BAGCHI)

.....J.
(V. MOHANA)

NEW DELHI;
JULY 20, 2026

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petition(s) for Arbitration No(s).9/2026

AYAN

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

ROADZEN INC

Respondent(s)

IA No. 8346/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

WITH

ARBIT.PETITON No. 34/2026 (PIL-W)

IA No. 144719/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

ARBIT.PETITON No. 35/2026 (PIL-W)

IA No. 140391/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

Date : 20-07-2026 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JOYMALYA BAGCHI
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE V. MOHANA

For Petitioner(s) :Mr. Abhinav Hansaraman, Adv.
Mr. Subhro Prokas Mukherjee, AOR

For Respondent(s) :Mr. Ayush Sharma, AOR
Mr. Ashish Sharma, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

1. The petitions are allowed in terms of the signed order.
2. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(ARJUN BISHT)

ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(PREETHI DILEEP KUMAR)

DY. REGISTRAR

(signed order is placed on the file)