



228
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

ARB-143-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 15.05.2026

SIRION LABS PRIVATE LIMITED

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

VEDANTA LIMITED (CAIRN OIL AND GAS DIVISION)

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present: Ms. Ekakshra Mahajan, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Nikhil Singhvi, Advocate,
(Through Video Conferencing) and
Mr. Ashish Rawlay, Advocate,
for the respondent.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (Oral)

1. The affidavit filed by the respondent dated 06.05.2026 is taken on record.
2. The present petition has been filed under Section 11 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act') praying for appointment of a Presiding Arbitrator.
3. The brief facts of the present case are that the petitioner had filed an arbitration petition before this Court bearing Arbitration Case No.416 of 2025, which was allowed by this Court on 14.11.2025. Since there was a provision for constitution of an Arbitral Tribunal consisting of three members, in which one was to be nominated by one party and the other



was to be nominated by other party and only the petitioner had nominated a retired Chief Justice of the High Court but the respondent did not appoint any Arbitrator, this Court therefore in view of the arbitration clause, nominated a former Judge of this Court as a second Arbitrator so that both of them may thereafter by consent nominate/select a Presiding Arbitrator for constituting an Arbitral Tribunal, as per the arbitration clause itself.

4. Thereafter, as per both the learned counsels for the parties, efforts were made by both the learned members of the Arbitral Tribunal for appointment of a Presiding Arbitrator but they could not do so. It was thereafter that an email was sent by one of the members of the Arbitral Tribunal, who is a retired Hon'ble Chief Justice, whereby it was conveyed that they are unable to appoint the Presiding Arbitrator in view of the fee structure prescribed. The aforesaid email has been attached with the present petition as Annexure P-9. In this way, the mechanism for constituting an Arbitral Tribunal failed.

5. The present petition was filed seeking appointment of a Presiding Arbitrator and both the learned counsels for the parties have submitted that considering the claim amount involved in the present case, it will be difficult to appoint any Presiding Arbitrator and therefore, both the learned counsels for the parties have submitted that in the facts and circumstances whereby it has become difficult to appoint a Presiding Arbitrator and rather when both the learned Arbitrators, who were earlier appointed have also failed in their efforts primarily because of the fee structure and the claim amount which is the subject matter of the present case, it would be appropriate that instead of constituting an Arbitral Tribunal, a Sole Arbitrator may be appointed by this Court.



6. In this regard, both the parties submitted their specific affidavits before this Court. The petitioner submitted an affidavit dated 30.04.2026. Para No.3 of the aforesaid affidavit is reproduced as under:-

“3. That on behalf of the Petitioner, I state that the Petitioner has no objection if a Sole Arbitrator is appointed by this Hon'ble Court, instead of a Presiding Arbitrator, to adjudicate upon the disputes between the Petitioner and the Respondent in the present matter.”

7. Similar, the respondent has also submitted its affidavit dated 06.05.2026. Para No.10 of the said affidavit is reproduced as under:-

“10. In furtherance of the same, and in compliance with the directions of this Hon'ble Court, the Respondent, vide the present affidavit, submits that it is agreeable to the reference of the disputes to the arbitration of a sole arbitrator, to be appointed by this Hon'ble Court, with the arbitral fees to be governed by the Fourth Schedule to the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.”

8. Both the learned counsels for the parties have submitted that considering the specific affidavits filed by the parties for appointment of a Sole Arbitrator, any independent Sole Arbitrator may be appointed by this Court.

9. In view of the above and considering the peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case, the present petition is allowed. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Dr. Vineet Kothari, a former Acting Chief Justice of Gujarat High Court, resident of Plot No. 947, 11th D Road, Sardarpura, Jodhpur, Rajasthan, Additional Address: C/o Mr. Sumendra Jain, Chartered Accountant, D-1203, Wembley Estate, Rosewood City, Sector 50, Gurugram-122018, Haryana, Mobile No.9480822552, Email ID:



kotharivineet@gmail.com, is nominated as the Sole Arbitrator to adjudicate the dispute between the parties, subject to compliance of statutory provisions including Section 12 of the Act.

10. Parties are directed to appear before the learned Arbitrator on date, time and place to be fixed and communicated by the learned Arbitrator at his convenience.

11. Fee shall be paid to the learned Arbitrator in accordance with the Fourth Schedule of the Arbitration Act, as amended.

12. Learned Arbitrator is also requested to complete the proceedings as per the time limit prescribed under Section 29-A of the Act.

13. A request letter alongwith a copy of the order be sent to Hon'ble Mr. Justice Dr. Vineet Kothari, a former Acting Chief Justice of Gujarat High Court.

15.05.2026

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)

JUDGE

rakesh

Whether speaking
Whether reportable

: Yes/No
: Yes/No