



**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR**

S.B. Arbitration Application No. 126/2025

M/s Rajkamal Builders Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd., having its Registered Office At 54, Park Hill Society, Ramdevnagar, Ahmedabad-380015, Gujarat, through its Director Sh. Mafatlal Bhagabhai Patel (DIN-00011072).

----Applicant/Claimant

Versus

Rajasthan Urban Infrastructure Development Project (RUIDP), Through Superintending Engineer, RUIDP, PIU, 6/1026, Shiv Nagar, Kuwada Road, Bhilwara-311001.

----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Vivek Dangi
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Kapil Sharma Mr. Divyanshu Charan

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANEESH SHARMA

Order

14/11/2025

1. The present arbitration application has been filed by the applicant under Section 29-A(5) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act of 1996'), seeking an extension of the mandate of the learned sole Arbitrator for an additional period of six (6) months with effect from 22.08.2025.
2. From the perusal of the record, it is evident that this court vide order dated 25.08.2023 appointed Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ajay Rastogi (Former Judge, Supreme Court of India) as a sole Arbitrator to adjudicate the dispute pending between the parties.
3. That pursuant to the said order dated 25.08.2023, the claimant filed a statement of claim on 10.11.2023 and a



statement of defense was filed on 30.01.2024, and further rejoinder was filed by the claimant on 24.02.2024 and on the basis of the pleadings of the parties, issues were framed by the learned sole arbitrator for the determination vide procedural order no. 4 dated 02.04.2024.

4. From the record of the case, it is evident that instant proceedings of arbitration could not be concluded within one year after completion of pleadings due to certain unforeseen circumstances.

5. Further, on the basis of the consensus arrived at between the parties, time to conclude the arbitral proceedings were extended by a period of six months vide procedural order no.9 dated 12.01.2025 under Section 29-A(5) the Act of 1996. However, despite best efforts, the arbitral proceedings could not be concluded within the extended period as well.

6. Consequently, the applicant has filed the present application for extension of time for a further period of six months with effect from 22.08.2025.

7. Learned counsel for the respondent, upon instructions from his client, submits that he has no objection for extending the period of arbitration proceedings.

8. Thus, in view of the consensus arrived at between the parties, in the interest of justice, further, since the order-sheets of the arbitral proceedings reflect that there exists sufficient cause for extension of period to conclude arbitral proceedings. Therefore, the present arbitration application filed under Section 29-A(4)(5) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 is allowed and the



period for concluding the instant arbitration proceedings is further extended by a period of six months with effect from 22.08.2025.

9. All other pending application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

(MANEESH SHARMA),J

SOURAV /149