

\$~SB-1

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

Rev.P.No.377/2019 and I.A.Nos.12591-93/2019 in
+ ARB.P.No.133/2019

GEETA PODDAR Petitioner
Through : Mr. Rajiv Dalal and Mr. Sanjeev
Kumar Sharma, Advs.

versus

SATYA DEVELOPERS PRIVATE LIMITED Respondent
Through : None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER
% **24.01.2020**

I.A.No.12592/2019

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

Rev.P.No.377/2019 and I.A.Nos.12591/2019 & 12593/2019

2. This review petition has been filed pursuant to the order passed by the Supreme Court on 29.03.2019 in SLP No.7125/2019.

2.1 To be noted, the review petitioner's petition under Section 11 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (in short "1996 Act") was dismissed, *albeit*, ex-parte based on an interpretative application of the judgment passed by the Supreme Court in *TRF Limited v. Energo Engineering Projects Limited, (2017) 8 SCC 311*.

3. Though, the review petitioner's counsel has not cited the judgments delivered by the Supreme Court thereafter, however, to my recollection, the Supreme Court in a judgment rendered in *Perkins Eastman Architects DPC & Anr. v. HSCC (India) Ltd., 2019 SCC OnLine SC 1517* has dealt with somewhat similar issue.
4. The matter may require consideration.
5. Accordingly, issue notice to the respondent in both, review petition as well as captioned applications, i.e. delay in filing and re-filing the review petition.
6. Liberty is given to the review petitioner to serve the respondent *via* all modes including private mode.
7. Renotify the review petition on 20.03.2020.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

JANUARY 24, 2020

aj