

## Considerations that weigh with court while appointing arbitrator under Section 11 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996

The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in its recent judgment<sup>1</sup> set aside a judgment of the High Court of Madhya Pradesh rejecting an application for appointment of arbitrator under Section 11 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 ("Act") on the ground that claims of the petitioner-contractor were barred by limitation. The Hon'ble Supreme Court held that after the 2015 amendments to the Act, court is only required to examine the existence of arbitration agreement. All other preliminary or threshold issues are to be decided by the arbitral tribunal under Section 16 of the Act.

In yet another decision<sup>2</sup>, reversing the judgement of Delhi High Court, the Supreme Court held that once parties consciously and with full understanding executed an amendment of agreement ("AOA"), whereby the contractor gave up all his claims and consented to the new arrangement specified in AOA including that there will be no arbitration for the settlement of any claims by the contractor in future, it is not open for the contractor to take recourse to arbitration process or to resurrect the claim which has been resolved in terms of the amended agreement. Accordingly, the Arbitration Petition for appointment of arbitrator was dismissed.



**Vikas Goel**  
Partner  
E: vikas@singhania.in

<sup>1</sup> Uttarakhand Purv Sainik Kalyan Nigam Limited Versus Northern Coal Field Limited reported in 2019 (6) Arb. LR 237 (SC)

<sup>2</sup> WAPCOS Ltd. vs Salma Dam Joint Venture & Another; 2019 (6) Arb. LR 247 (SC)

Again in another matter<sup>3</sup> relating to appointment of arbitrator arising out of a judgement of Delhi High Court, the Supreme Court refused to accept the plea that by signing a “no claim” certificate the contractor is barred from demanding arbitration. Leaving the merits of the contention for the arbitral tribunal to decide, the Supreme Court directed for appointment of arbitrator as per the parameters provided in the contract and set aside appointment of independent arbitrator by the High Court.

© 2019 All rights reserved. This article is for information purposes only. No part of the article may be reproduced or copied in any form or by any means [graphic, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, taping or information retrieval systems] or reproduced on any disc, tape, perforated media or other information storage device, etc., without the explicit written permission of Singhania & Partners LLP, Solicitors & Advocates (“The Firm”).

**Disclaimer:** Though every effort has been made to avoid errors or omissions in this article, errors might creep in. Any mistake, error or discrepancy noted by the readers may be brought to the notice of the firm along with evidence of it being incorrect. All such errors shall be corrected at the earliest. It is notified that neither the firm nor any person related with the firm in any manner shall be responsible for any damage or loss of action to anyone, of any kind, in any manner, therefrom

---

<sup>3</sup> UOI Vs. BM Construction Company; 2019 (6) Arb. LR 284 (SC)