

ITEM NO.52

COURT NO.5

SECTION XI

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No. 25564/2025

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 23-07-2025 in AUS37AACAD No. 302/2024 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Allahabad]

MESERS LAW PUBLISHERS & ANR.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

VIRENDER SAGAR & ORS.

Respondent(s)

Mediation report received.

IA No. 288727/2026 - CLARIFICATION/DIRECTION

IA No. 222831/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT, IA No. 222830/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T., IA No. 288728/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. IA No. 232868/2025 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

Date : 26-10-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE J.B. PARDIWALA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. VINOD CHANDRAN

For Petitioner(s) :

Mr. Sanjiv Sen, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Sanjay Vashishtha, Adv.
Mr. Siddhartha Goswami, Adv.
Mr. Prahalad Balaji, Adv.

Ms. Jharna Singh, Adv.
Ms. Charu Mathur- 1642, AOR

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Akshat Srivastava- 3037, AOR

Mr. Anupam Lal Das, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Nikhil Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Anirudh Singh, Adv.
Mr. Prabhat Ranjan Raj- 3810, AOR

Ms. Shipra Mathur- 1611, AOR

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

The Special Leave Petition challenges an order which declined to interfere with the rejection of an application under Section 9 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.

2. We found no reason to interfere with the same, however, we were curious as to whether any application under Section 11 of the Act of 1996 was moved, especially, when the High Court noticed that there was no such application moved. We are informed that an application has been moved before the High Court of Judicature at Allahabad and has been pending for long and there is no chance of it being considered in the near future. Allegations were also made that the respondents were constantly taking adjournment, which was stoutly denied by the respondents.

3. In any event, since a dispute exists between the parties and there is an application moved under Section 11, we were of the opinion that an Arbitrator could be appointed by us. However, learned Counsel for the respondent raised a contention that there was no arbitrable dispute and the petitioner cannot claim any association, much less a partnership with the respondent.

4. We would only clarify that all disputes could be raised before the learned Arbitrator including the very contention against the validity of constituting an Arbitration itself and even prayers for interim orders could be considered independently, without being influenced by the impugned order herein.

5. On consent of the parties, we appoint Hon'ble Smt. Justice Chandrasekharan Sudha, Former Judge of the Delhi High Court (Mobile No. +91 94460 45653) as the Arbitrator to adjudicate upon the disputes that have arisen between the parties. The learned Arbitrator shall issue notices to the parties in connection with the arbitral proceedings. The learned Arbitrator is free to determine her fee in

consultation with the parties. We make it clear that we have expressed no opinion on the merits of the case, which aspect is left open for the parties to urge before the learned Arbitrator.

6. The Registry of the Court shall inform the Learned Arbitrator.

7. With the aforesaid, the Special Leave Petition stands disposed of.

8. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(CHANDRESH)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(POOJA SHARMA)
COURT MASTER (NSH)