

ORDER SHEET

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA  
ORIGINAL SIDE  
(COMMERCIAL DIVISION)

AP-COM/481/2026

MR. VIKRAM SURANA  
VS  
FUTURE ENTERPRISES LIMITED

BEFORE:

The Hon'ble JUSTICE GAURANG KANTH

Date : 8<sup>th</sup> July, 2026.

Appearance

*Mr. Sukrit Mukherjee, Adv.*  
*Mr. Arindam Paul, Adv.*  
*Ms. Debarati Das, Adv.*  
*Mr. Shuvojeet Gupta, Adv.*  
*Ms. Sohini Choudhury, Adv.*  
*...for the petitioner*

*Mr. Chayan Gupta, Adv.*  
*Ms. Darshana Sett, Adv.*  
*Ms. Priyansha Agarwal, Adv.*  
*..for the respondent no. 2*

The Court: The petitioners are the legal heirs and representatives of the original claimant, Mr. Laxmipat Surana, who died intestate on 17.05.2026.

The present petition has been preferred by the legal heirs under Section 29A of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, seeking extension of the mandate of the arbitral tribunal for conclusion of the arbitral proceedings and publication of the arbitral award.

Learned Counsel for the petitioners submits that this Court, vide order dated 07.04.2021, constituted the arbitral tribunal. The pleadings were completed on 10.08.2022. Thereafter, vide order dated 10.09.2024, this Court substituted the original Arbitrator with Justice Subrata Talukdar (Retd.). Learned Counsel for the petitioners further submits that the

mandate of the arbitral tribunal expired on 30.11.2025 and, with the consent of the parties, the same was extended for a period of six months, i.e., till 30.05.2026.

Learned Counsel for the petitioners submits that the matter is presently at the stage of recording of evidence.

Learned Counsel for the petitioners further submits that the original claimant expired on 17.05.2026 and that the petitioners had moved an application for substitution before the learned arbitral tribunal. The said application is pending disposal. In the meantime, since the mandate has already expired, the petitioners have approached this Court seeking extension of the mandate of the arbitral tribunal.

Learned Counsel for the respondent states that he has no objection to the present application. However, he submits that since the application for substitution is pending adjudication before the learned arbitral tribunal, the same should have no bearing on the present petition. He states that, for adjudication of the substitution application, the mandate of the arbitral tribunal requires to be extended, and that the present application shall be treated only for the purposes of extension of the mandate of the arbitral tribunal.

Upon consideration of the submissions of the parties and the materials placed on record, this Court is satisfied that there has been no undue or unwarranted delay on the part of the learned sole Arbitrator in concluding the proceedings.

Having regard to the advanced stage of the proceedings and in the interest of justice, the mandate of the arbitral tribunal is extended further for a period of eight months from today.

It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the substitution application, and that the present order is confined solely to the question of extension of the mandate of the arbitral tribunal.

The learned Arbitrator is requested to make all reasonable endeavours to conclude the arbitral proceedings and publish the arbitral award within the extended time period.

With the aforesaid observations, the present petition stands disposed of.

(GAURANG KANTH, J.)