INDIALAW



ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION

Arbitration Survives Termination: Telangana High Court Clarifies Scope In Urbanwoods Realty Real Estate Dispute

AUTHOR Supriya Bhosale
PUBLISHED 17 June 2025

Introduction

The High Court of Telangana has reaffirmed the sanctity of arbitration agreements in a real estate dispute between Urbanwoods Realty LLP and Mrs. Uma Rastogi (deceased) and another. The case, Arbitration Application No. 41 of 2023, highlights the importance of arbitration in resolving complex commercial disputes and provides valuable insights into the interpretation of arbitration clauses and the separability doctrine.

Background of the Case

Urbanwoods Realty LLP, a real estate developer, entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with Mrs. Uma Rastogi and another party for the joint development of a 2-acre plot in Khajaguda Village, Serlingampally Mandal, Rangareddy District. The MoU, dated July 1, 2020, outlined the terms of the development project, including timelines, payment obligations, and the division of constructed area. The respondents were entitled to 2,10,000 sq. feet of the constructed area and a refundable security deposit of Rs. 10 crores.

Subsequently, an agreement of sale was executed on the same date, stipulating a sale consideration of Rs. 80 crores. The agreement detailed the payment schedule and further extended the timeline for the development project. However, disputes arose over the fulfillment of these obligations. The respondents later executed an indemnity bond dated January 13, 2023, asserting that the MoU had been terminated and the security deposit forfeited. This became a key point of contention in the current legal proceedings..

Key Legal Issues

1. Appointment of Arbitrator

The applicant, Urbanwoods Realty LLP, sought the appointment of a sole arbitrator under Section 11(5) and (6) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996. The respondents contended that the MoU and the agreement of sale were terminated due to the efflux of time and non-payment of the agreed sale consideration. They argued that the arbitration clause was no longer enforceable.

2. Separability Doctrine

The court addressed the doctrine of separability, which holds that an arbitration clause is independent of the main contract. Even if the main contract is terminated, the arbitration clause can still be invoked. The court cited Section 16(1) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, emphasizing that the arbitration agreement survives the termination of the main contract.

3. Scope of Inquiry under Section 11

The court clarified that the referral court's role under Section 11 is limited to determining whether a prima facie arbitration agreement exists. The court should not examine the merits of the dispute or the validity of the contract termination at this stage. This interpretation ensures that the arbitration process is not unduly delayed or interfered with by preliminary judicial scrutiny.

4. Interconnected Agreements

The court held that the MoU and the agreement of sale should be read together as part of the same transaction. Despite the use of the word "may" in the arbitration clause of the agreement of sale, the court found that the intention to arbitrate was clear when both agreements were considered together. This interpretation ensures that the intention of the parties to arbitrate disputes is not defeated by the wording of a single clause in one of the agreements.

5. Insufficient Stamping of Agreements

The respondents raised an objection regarding the insufficient stamping of the MoU and the agreement of sale. The court cited a Supreme Court decision, holding that issues of insufficient stamping should be left for the arbitral tribunal to decide. This interpretation ensures that minor procedural issues do not prevent parties from accessing arbitration.

Judgment and Implications

The High Court of Telangana allowed the arbitration application, appointing Sri Justice V. V. S. Rao, Former Judge of the High Court of Andhra Pradesh, as the sole arbitrator. The court held that a valid arbitration agreement exists between the parties and that all issues, including the termination of the MoU and the agreement of sale, should be decided by the arbitral tribunal.

Interpretation of 'May' in an Agreement

One of the critical aspects of this judgment is the interpretation of the word "may" in the arbitration clause of the agreement of sale. The respondents argued that the use of "may" introduced an element of uncertainty and rendered the arbitration clause unenforceable. However, the court held that when read together with the MoU, which clearly provided for arbitration, the intention of the parties to arbitrate was evident. The court cited the Supreme Court's decision in Olympus Superstructures (P) Ltd. v. Meena Vijay Khetan (1999) 5 SCC 651, which emphasized that in interconnected agreements, the arbitration clause in the main agreement governs disputes arising under both agreements.

Conclusion

The High Court of Telangana's judgment in Urbanwoods Realty LLP vs Mrs. Uma Rastogi & Another is a significant contribution to the jurisprudence on arbitration law. It deals with the importance of arbitration as a dispute resolution mechanism, particularly in complex commercial transactions. The court's interpretation of the word "may" in the arbitration clause is particularly noteworthy, as it reflects a pragmatic approach to enforcing the parties' intention to arbitrate.

The judgment also highlights the need for clear and unambiguous arbitration clauses in agreements. While the court was able to infer the intention to arbitrate from the interconnected nature of the agreements, parties would be well-advised to use definitive language in their arbitration clauses to avoid ambiguity. This judgment is a reminder that arbitration is a valuable tool for resolving disputes efficiently and effectively, provided that the arbitration agreements are properly drafted and enforced.

The High Court of Telangana's decision reaffirms the sanctity of arbitration agreements and provides valuable guidance for legal practitioners and businesses. It emphasizes the importance of clear arbitration clauses and the limited role of the referral court under Section 11, ensuring that arbitration proceedings are not unduly delayed or interfered with by preliminary judicial scrutiny. This judgment shows the robustness of arbitration as a dispute resolution mechanism and offers valuable insights for legal practitioners and businesses alike.

For more details, write to us at: contact@indialaw.in

Related Practice Areas

Arbitration