



2025:TSHC:39743

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD

FRIDAY, THE FOURTEENTH DAY OF NOVEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE SRI APARESH KUMAR SINGH

ARBITRATION APPLICATION NO: 96 OF 2025

Between:

M/s. Prima Urbanscapes Pvt. Ltd., Represented by its Managing Director Sri. Nandi Ravinder Reddy, Office at Plot No. 13A, Rao and Raju Colony, Road No. 2, Banjara Hills, Hyderabad, 500034

...PETITIONER

AND

1. Sri P. Srinivas Goud, S/o. Late P. Bala Goud, Age 54 years, Occ Business, R/o. H. No. 1-52, Ward No. 2, Near Gram-Panchayat Office, Mallampet Village, Dundigal- Gandimaisamma Mandal, Medchal Malkajgiri Dist-502303
2. Smt P. Prasanna Rani Goud, W/o. Late P. Prakash Goud, Age 53 years, Occ Housewife, R/o. MIG 1865, Old MIG, BHEL, RC Puram Lingampally
3. Sri P. Bhargav Teja Goud, S/o. Late P. Surender Goud, Age 28 years, Occ Business, R/o. Villa No. 56, Prima Paradiso, Mallampet Village, Dundigal Gandimaisamma Mandal, Medchal Malkajgiri Dist-502303
4. P. Sai Vikas Goud, S/o. Late P. Prakash Goud, Age 24 years, Occ Student, R/o. MIG #1865, Old MIG, BHEL, RC Puram Lingampally.

(Respondent No.2, 3 and 4 are Proforma Parties and no notices are necessary)

...RESPONDENTS

Arbitration Application Under Section 11 (5) and (6) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act 1996 r/w Scheme for Appointment of Arbitrator, 1996 praying that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased

- a) To appoint a Sole Arbitrator for reasonable fees to resolve the disputes between the Applicant and the Respondent No.1 arising out of the Development Agreement-cum-Irrevocable General Power of Attorney dated 29.06.2016



2025:TSHC:39743

b) To award costs of the Application

**Counsel for the Petitioner: Sri V.V.N.K. Sarath Saran representing
Sri B Rajeshwar Reddy**

Counsel for the Respondents: -

The Court made the following: ORDER



2025:TSHC:39743

THE HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE SRI APARESH KUMAR SINGH

ARBITRATION APPLICATION No.96 of 2025

ORDER:

Heard Mr. V.V.N.K.Sarath Saran, learned counsel representing Mr. B.Rajeshwar Reddy, learned counsel for the applicant.

2. By order dated 22.08.2025, this Court proposed to appoint Mr. Justice Sambasivarao Naidu, a former Judge of this Court as an independent Arbitrator to adjudicate the dispute between the parties. The order dated 22.08.2025 is extracted hereunder for easy reference:

“Mr. B.Rajeshwar Reddy, learned counsel for the applicant.

Heard learned counsel for the applicant.

Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the dispute under the Development Agreement-cum-Irrevocable General Power of Attorney dated 29.06.2016 is as against respondent No.1 only since respondent Nos.2 to 4 have settled the matter outside the Court after filing of Arbitration O.P.No.39 of 2025 before learned IX Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Courts, Hyderabad.

The Development Agreement-cum-Irrevocable General Power of Attorney dated 29.06.2016 provides for an arbitration clause No.31, which reads as under:

“31. In case of any dispute arising between the parties hereto touching these presents, the matter shall be referred to the Arbitrator authorities, chosen one by each party and in case of

difference of opinion between the Arbitrators, to choose a third Arbitrator as common umpire and their award shall be final and binding on all parties and the relevant provisions of the Indian Arbitration Act shall apply to the proceedings. All costs of arbitration shall be borne by both parties in equal proportion. Courts at Hyderabad shall only have jurisdiction to file a case if deemed fit."

Respondent No.1 has failed to respond to the notice dated 19.02.2025, Annexure P-12 at Page No.118.

According to the applicant, the summary of the claims is provided under Para 14 as against all the landlords respondent Nos.1 to 4.

However, learned counsel for the applicant submits that since respondent Nos.2 to 4 have settled the matter, the remaining claims as against respondent No.1 are due to the extent of Rs.1,15,90,646/- as per the tabular chart enclosed at para 21. Learned counsel for the applicant, however, submits that this Court may appoint a sole Arbitrator in place of a panel of Arbitrators.

The matter was adjourned in the previous date to enable the learned counsel for the applicant to satisfy on the issue of appointment of a sole Arbitrator when the arbitration clause provides for a panel of Arbitrators.

Learned counsel for the applicant has relied upon a decision of the Apex Court in the case of **Union of India v. Singh Builders Syndicate** [(2009) 4 SCC 523] and submitted that the Apex Court in the facts of the said case did not interfere in the appointment of a sole Arbitrator by the Delhi High Court after taking note of the precedents such as **Northern Railway Admn., Ministry of Railway v. Patel Engg. Co. Ltd** [(2008) 10 SCC 240]. He submits that the decision of the Apex Court has been followed by the Delhi High Court in a recent judgment in Arbitration Petition No.24 of 2024 dated 22.05.2024. It is submitted that since the respondent No.1 has failed to respond to the notice dated 19.02.2025 for appointment of an Arbitrator and also failed to appear before this Court after notice, appointment of a sole Arbitrator would be in the



interest of the parties and also prevent delays and frequent changes in an arbitral Tribunal comprising more than one Arbitrator. He submitted that therefore this Court may appoint an independent sole Arbitrator to adjudicate the dispute between the parties.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances noted above and the submission of the learned counsel for the applicant and the decision cited above, this Court proposes to appoint a former Judge of this Court Mr. Justice Sambasivarao Naidu (residing at Surya – A-221, Western Plaza, Shaikpet, OU Colony, Hyderabad-500008, Phone No.040-29356216) as an Arbitrator to adjudicate the dispute between the petitioner and respondent No.1. The proposed Arbitrator is requested to submit his consent and a declaration in terms of Section 12(1) read with Schedule VI of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.

Registry is directed to communicate this order to the proposed Arbitrator.

The matter be listed after two weeks with the response, if any, of the proposed Arbitrator.”

3. The proposed Arbitrator has submitted his consent along with a declaration under Section 12(1) read with Schedule VI of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (for short ‘the Act’) by letter dated 29.10.2025.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant, therefore, submits that appointment of the proposed Arbitrator may be confirmed.

5. In that view of the matter, I hereby appoint Mr. Justice Sambasivarao Naidu, a former Judge of this Court (resident of Surya – A-221, Western Plaza, Shaikpet, OU Colony,

Hyderabad-500008, Mobile No.9494404443), to act as an independent Arbitrator in respect of the dispute between the parties.

6. Registry is directed to serve a xerox copy of the entire pleadings to the learned Arbitrator. The learned Arbitrator is requested to keep in mind the fee prescribed in Schedule IV of the Act and the time limit prescribed under Section 29A of the Act.

7. The Arbitration Application is, accordingly, disposed of.

Miscellaneous applications pending, if any, shall stand closed.

//TRUE COPY//

SD/- I.NAGA LAKSHMI
JOINT REGISTRAR

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. Mr. Justice Sambasivarao Naidu, a former Judge of High Court for the State of Telangana (Resident of Surya-A-221, Western Plaza, Shaikpet, OU Colony, Hyderabad-500008, Mobile No. 9494404443) (**By Special Messenger**) (**along with a copy of affidavit and material papers**)
2. One CC to Sri B. Rajeshwar Reddy Advocate [OPUC]
3. Two CD Copies

VH/PSL



2025:TSHC:39743

HIGH COURT

DATED: 14/11/2025

ORDER

ARBAPPL.No.96 of 2025



**DISPOSING OF THE
ARBITRATION APPLICATION**

⑤ MT
20/11/25