

ITEM NO.54

COURT NO.14

SECTION XII

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(s). 26057/2026

[Arising out of impugned judgment and order dated 21-07-2026 in CRP No. 4209/2026 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Madras at Chennai]

GOWRI SHANKAR & ANR.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

GORAMAN INTEGRATED LOGISTICS PRIVATE LIMITED

Respondent(s)

IA No. 221847/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF I/JUDGMENT

Date : 04-08-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.V. VISWANATHAN
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Gaurav Agrawal, Sr.Adv.
Mr. Anish R. Shah, AOR

For Respondent(s) Mr. Satish Parasaran, Sr. Adv. (through VC)
Ms. Ayshwarya Chandar, AOR
Mr. G Vivekanand, Adv.
Ms. Varuni Mohan, Adv.
Mr. Krishna Sridhar, Adv.

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

1. Heard Mr. Gaurav Agrawal, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners and Mr. Satish Parasaran, learned Senior Counsel for the respondent appearing on caveat.
2. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners submits that in a challenge to an order of petition filed under Section 8 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (for short, 'A&C Act') referring the parties to arbitration, the High Court has, in the impugned order, granted injunction as well as

stay. Learned Senior Counsel submits that there was no occasion to pass an order of injunction and the only question before the High Court was whether the order in the petition under Section 8 of the A&C Act, referring the parties to arbitration, was in accordance with law or not.

3. On the other hand, the learned Senior Counsel for the respondent(s) contends that the respondent - caveator is not a party to the Memorandum of Undertaking (for short, 'MOU'), where the arbitration clause occurs. The petitioner(s) has on the principle that impleading a non-signatory also could be referred to arbitration, obtained an order under Section 8 of the A&C Act. Learned Senior Counsel further contends that, if the suit they had filed appropriate injunction application, however, since the counter was not filed by the petitioners herein and instead they had filed a petition under Section 8 of the A&C Act, the Section 8 petition was taken up on priority basis and the order made referring parties to arbitration.

4. Learned Senior Counsel contends that the net result was while they could not move the injunction in the suit. The only option left with them was to seek appropriate interim protection in the revision filed against the order in their challenge to the Section 8 order.

5. We noticed that the matter is posted tomorrow i.e. on 05.08.2026 before the High Court. We have only set out the broad contentions of the parties. The High Court may, while adjudicating the CRP No.4209/2026, keep all contentions

including the contention raised by Mr.Gaurav Agrawal and Mr.Satish Parasaran, learned Senior Counsels for both the parties, here and pass orders on merits uninfluenced by any of the observations made in the impugned order or in the order made by us today.

6. We request the High Court to make an endeavour to dispose of the matter tomorrow itself or on such earlier date that the High Court may chose to keep the matter.

7. Learned Senior Counsels on both sides agreed that the matter will be argued without taking any adjournment whatsoever.

8. With the above observations, the Special Leave Petition is disposed of.

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

(NIRMALA NEGI)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(MANOJ KUMAR)
COURT MASTER (NSH)