

Dispute Resolution Hotline

March 03, 2010

SUPREME COURT SAYS IT'S UNFORTUNATE THAT ARBITRATION IN INDIA IS EXPENSIVE AND TIME-CONSUMING

In *Dolphin Drilling Ltd. ("Petitioner") v. M/s. Oil and Natural Gas Corporation Ltd. ("Respondent")*¹, the Supreme Court of India ("Court") has, amongst other things, held that the fact that there is already an ongoing arbitration in respect of other disputes between the same parties under the same agreement, would not come in the way of either party invoking a fresh arbitration in respect of other arbitrable disputes under the same agreement. Thus, multiple arbitrations for different disputes under one agreement can be possible.

FACTS:

The Petitioner and the Respondent entered into agreement dated October 17, 2003 for, *inter alia*, charter hire of deepwater drilling rig drill ship alongwith services on an integrated basis ("**Agreement**"). Whilst the period of the Agreement came to an end on February 13, 2007, the Petitioner contended that they continued to provide services until April 10, 2007 for which they were entitled to be paid additionally. Failing to get any response from the Respondent in spite of repeated reminders, the Petitioner invoked arbitration under the Agreement and nominated an ex-judge of the Supreme Court of India as their arbitrator. The Respondent failed to respond to the arbitration notice and accordingly, the Petitioner filed an application under Section 11(6) of the Arbitration & Conciliation Act, 1996 ("**the Act**"), for appointment of arbitrator in the Supreme Court of India, this being an International Commercial Arbitration under the Act.

The Respondent contended that the arbitration clause as set forth in the Agreement provided for one single arbitration which would encompass all disputes between the same parties under the same Agreement. The Respondent's further contention was that the arbitration clause in the Agreement does not envisage different arbitrations for different disputes at different times under the same Agreement arising between the same parties. The relevant provision reads as under:

".....28.3 The party desiring the settlement of dispute shall give notice of its intention to go in for arbitration **clearly stating all disputes to be decided by arbitral tribunal** and appoint its own arbitrator and call upon the other party to appoint its own arbitrator within 30 days....."

(emphasis supplied)

The Respondent submitted that as the Petitioner had already invoked arbitration under the Agreement earlier, which arbitration was at its concluding stage, the said remedy of arbitration was no longer open to the Petitioner. The Respondent further submitted that the financial burden cast upon them by arbitration was onerous.

JUDGMENT:

Recognizing the issue at hand and terming it as "*unfortunate*", the Court observed that arbitration in India has proved to be a highly expensive and time-consuming means for resolution of disputes. The Court, however, held that the words "*all disputes*" in the Agreement, which formed the bone of contention of this matter, would necessarily have to be interpreted to mean all disputes which may be in existence when the arbitration clause is invoked.

Noting that the interpretation as suggested by the counsel for the Respondent could lead to an anomalous situation where disputes which occurred in the earlier period of the Agreement could be rendered *time-barred* at the end of the period of the Agreement, the Court rejected the contention of the Respondent that arbitration was provided only as a onetime measure.

Appreciating that increased cost of dispute resolution had indeed become a cause for concern, the Court noted that the issue of financial burden was a legitimate concern and would need to be addressed by the parties by amending the arbitration clause and providing for a single arbitration at the end of the period of the Agreement or at its earlier termination/cancellation and at that time, suitably providing for the express saving of any dispute/claim which would otherwise become time-barred and hence, non-arbitrable.

ANALYSIS:

This judgment of the Court has, amongst other things, acknowledged that arbitration in India is an expensive and time consuming dispute resolution mechanism. The very objective of providing for arbitration, which is to ensure fast and efficient disposal of disputes between the parties to the arbitration agreement, has been lost.

Parties to an arbitration agreement can now provide to avoid the onerous financial implications of multiple arbitrations under a single agreement and can instead, provide for a single onetime arbitration to be conducted at the end of the period of the agreement (or its sooner determination). This can prove to be a twin-edged sword given that a party with a legitimate claim will have no option but to wait until a certain time until they are able to invoke arbitration, thus negating the object of arbitration in the very first place.

Research Papers

M&A In The Indian Technology Sector

February 19, 2025

Unlocking Capital

February 11, 2025

Fintech

January 28, 2025

Research Articles

Re-Evaluating Press Note 3 Of 2020: Should India's Land Borders Still Define Foreign Investment Boundaries?

February 04, 2025

INDIA 2025: The Emerging Powerhouse for Private Equity and M&A Deals

January 15, 2025

Key changes to Model Concession Agreements in the Road Sector

January 03, 2025

Audio

Securities Market Regulator's Continued Quest Against "Unfiltered" Financial Advice

December 18, 2024

Digital Lending - Part 1 - What's New with NBFC P2Ps

November 19, 2024

Renewable Roadmap: Budget 2024 and Beyond - Part I

August 26, 2024

NDA Connect

Connect with us at events, conferences and seminars.

NDA Hotline

Click here to view Hotline archives.

Video

Arbitration Amendment Bill 2024: A Few Suggestions | Legally Speaking With Tarun Nangia | NewsX

February 12, 2025

An arbitration agreement no longer remains a simple agreement to refer all disputes to arbitration. Over time, an arbitration agreement has evolved into a complex mechanism and an integral provision in any agreement. Care must be taken to ensure that foreseeable situations have been envisaged and necessary provisions have been made especially when there is a possibility that parties will continue to perform under the terms of the same agreement while there would be a dispute pending. Parties would now be well-advised to ensure that the arbitration clause is carefully worded and encompasses the true intention of the parties.

- Sahil Kanuga & Shafaq Uraizee-Sapre

1 Order dated February 17, 2010 in Arbitration Petition No. 21 of 2009;

DISCLAIMER

The contents of this hotline should not be construed as legal opinion. View detailed disclaimer.

This Hotline provides general information existing at the time of preparation. The Hotline is intended as a news update and Nishith Desai Associates neither assumes nor accepts any responsibility for any loss arising to any person acting or refraining from acting as a result of any material contained in this Hotline. It is recommended that professional advice be taken based on the specific facts and circumstances. This Hotline does not substitute the need to refer to the original pronouncements.

This is not a Spam mail. You have received this mail because you have either requested for it or someone must have suggested your name. Since India has no anti-spamming law, we refer to the US directive, which states that a mail cannot be considered Spam if it contains the sender's contact information, which this mail does. In case this mail doesn't concern you, please unsubscribe from mailing list.

What India’s Transition to New Data Protection Law Means for Global Businesses
January 23, 2025

India 2025: The Emerging Powerhouse for Private Equity and M&A Deals
January 16, 2025