ITEM NOS.20+67+70 COURT NO.12 SECTION XIV

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s). 36806/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 01-09-2026 in OMP(ENF.)(COMM.) No. 155/2026 passed by the High Court of Delhi at New Delhi]

M/S URC CONSTRUCTION (P) LTD Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

AIRPORTS AUTHORITY OF INDIA Respondent(s)
FOR ADMISSION

WITH
Diary No(s). 63620/2026 (XIV) (item no.20.1)
IA No. 336879/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF I/JUDGMENT, IA No. 336878/2026 - PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..)

WITH
SLP (C) No(s). 37563/2026 (item no.67)
IA No. 328560/2026 - PERMISSION TO FILE LENGTHY LIST OF DATES

SLP (C) No(s). 38820-38821/2026 (item no.70)
IA No. 341806/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF I/JUDGMENT

Date : 03-11-2026 These petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.V. VISWANATHAN
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

For Petitioner(s) **Mr. Sunil Kumar, Sr. Adv.**
Mr. Saurabh Suman Sinha, Adv.
Mr. Mrigank Prabhakar- 2507, AOR
Ms. Yerradoddy Charvi Reddy, Adv.

Mr. Vikas Mehta- 1435, AOR
Mr. V Ganesan, Adv.
Ms. Nitika Grover, Adv.
Mr. Vaishnav Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Vaishak Omanakuttan, Adv.

Signature Not Verified
Digitally signed by NIRMALA NEGI
Date: 2026.11.04 16:15:44 IST
Reason:

Mr. Sunil Kumar, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Saurabh Suman Sinha, Adv.
Mr. Mrigank Prabhakar- 2507, AOR
Ms. Yerradoddy Charvi Reddy, Adv.

Mr. Anshumaan Sahni, Adv.

Ms. Anindita Mitra- 2634, AOR

For Respondent(s) **Mr. Anshul Rai- 3198 , AOR**
Mr. Digvijay Rai, Adv.
Mr. Anshul Rai, Adv.
Mr. Archit Goel, Adv.
Mr. S.k Pandey, Adv.
Mr. Chandrashekhar A Chakalabbi, Adv.
Mr. Ojaswa Pathak, Adv.
Ms. Mallika Ranjan, Adv.
Mr. Raunaq Singh, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

SLP(C) No(s). 36806/2026 and SLP (C) No(s). 38820-38821/2026 (Item Nos.20 & 70)

1. Heard Mr. Vikas Mehta, learned counsel for the petitioner(s) in SLP(C)No.36806/2026, Mr. Anshumaan Sahni, learned counsel for the petitioner(s) in SLP (C)Nos.38820-38821/2026 petitioner(s) and Mr. Digvijay Rai, learned counsel appearing on caveat for the respondent(s).

2. Mr. Vikas Mehta, learned counsel for the petitioner(s) contends that the directions in the impugned order are contrary to the provisions of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (for short, 'Stamp Act'). Drawing particular attention to Section 33 of the Stamp Act, learned counsel contends that only when a document required to be stamped, comes up before an authority competent to receive the evidence and if the said authority is of the opinion that this instrument is not duly stamped, the procedure of impounding can be resorted to. Learned counsel contends that when an enforcement petition is filed or when any proceeding is filed before the Registry concerned, the officials of the concerned Registry, while numbering the matter, are not

officials at that stage competent to receive evidence. Learned counsel contends that in the present case, stamping for the enforcement petition was in accordance with the practice direction dated 13.07.2026 issued by the High Court of Delhi, which reads as follows:-

> ***"Hon'ble the Chief Justice has been pleased to direct that in every execution petition under Section 36 of the Arbitration & Conciliation Act, 1996, the Petitioner/Decree Holder shall make a declaration in bold capital letters on the top of the index that he has paid the stamp duty on the award.***
>
> ***As regards, pending execution petition under Section 36 of the Arbitration & Conciliation Act, 1996, the Petitioner/Decree Holder shall pay the stamp duty on the award(where not paid) within a period of four weeks from the date of issue of this practice direction."***

3. Mr. Vikas Mehta, learned counsel for the petitioner(s) contends that in view of the same there was no occasion to direct impounding. Learned counsel further drawing attention to the operative order, submits that except direction no.1, the validity of the rest of the directions require examination.

4. Mr. Anshumaan Sahni, learned counsel for the petitioner(s) submits that though the stamping was prior to the practice directions, it was in accord with the practice directions.

5. Issue notice, returnable on 25th January, 2027.

6. Till further orders, the operation and effect of the impugned order dated 01-09-2026 in OMP(ENF.)(COMM.) No.155/2026

passed by the High Court of Delhi at New Delhi in SLP(C)No.36806/2026, shall remain stayed. The operation and effect of the impugned order dated 07.09.2026 in OMP(ENF.)No.2/2026 and Execution Application (OS) No.97/2026 shall remain stayed in SLP (C) Nos.38820-38821/2026.

7. The pendency of the proceedings will not come in the way of the Court proceedings with the execution in both the matters.

8. We further direct that the practice directions issued by the High Court of Delhi dated 13.07.2026, shall continue to operate.

9. Call on 25th January, 2027.

<u>Diary No(s). 63620/2026 & SLP (C) No(s). 37563/2026 (Item Nos.20.1 & 67)</u>

1. Heard Mr. Sunil Kumar, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner(s) and Mr. Digvijay Rai, learned counsel appearing on caveat for the respondent(s).

2. List both the matters on 05th January, 2027.

(NIRMALA NEGI)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(NIKITA SINGH)
COURT MASTER (NSH)