INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed



www.ijlra.com

ISSN: 2582-6433

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted, or distributed in any form or by any means, whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission of the Managing Editor of the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)*.

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles published in this journal are solely those of the respective authors. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, or the Publisher of IJLRA.

Although every reasonable effort has been made to ensure the accuracy, authenticity, and proper citation of the content published in this journal, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible, in any manner whatsoever, for any loss, damage, or consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the information contained in this publication.

The content published herein is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice or professional opinion.

Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis. All rights reserved.

ISSN: 2582-6433

ABOUT US

The *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)* (ISSN: 2582-6433) is a peer-reviewed, academic, online journal published on a monthly basis. The journal aims to provide a comprehensive and interactive platform for the publication of original and high-quality legal research.

IJLRA publishes Short Articles, Long Articles, Research Papers, Case Comments, Book Reviews, Essays, and interdisciplinary studies in the field of law and allied disciplines. The journal seeks to promote critical analysis and informed discourse on contemporary legal, social, and policy issues.

The primary objective of IJLRA is to enhance academic engagement and scholarly dialogue among law students, researchers, academicians, legal professionals, and members of the Bar and Bench. The journal endeavours to establish itself as a credible and widely cited academic publication through the publication of original, well-researched, and analytically sound contributions.

IJLRA welcomes submissions from all branches of law, provided the work is original, unpublished, and submitted in accordance with the prescribed submission guidelines. All manuscripts are subject to a rigorous peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis* aspires to contribute meaningfully to legal scholarship and the development of law as an instrument of justice and social progress.

ISSN: 2582-6433

PUBLICATION ETHICS, COPYRIGHT & AUTHOR RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENT

The *International Journal for Legal Research and Analysis (IJLRA)* is committed to upholding the highest standards of publication ethics and academic integrity. All manuscripts submitted to the journal must be original, unpublished, and free from plagiarism, data fabrication, falsification, or any form of unethical research or publication practice. Authors are solely responsible for the accuracy, originality, legality, and ethical compliance of their work and must ensure that all sources are properly cited and that necessary permissions for any third-party copyrighted material have been duly obtained prior to submission. Copyright in all published articles vests with IJLRA, unless otherwise expressly stated, and authors grant the journal the irrevocable right to publish, reproduce, distribute, and archive their work in print and electronic formats. The views and opinions expressed in the articles are those of the authors alone and do not reflect the views of the Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, or Publisher. IJLRA shall not be liable for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the content published. By submitting a manuscript, the author(s) agree to fully indemnify and hold harmless the journal, its Editor-in-Chief, Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, and Management against any claims, liabilities, or legal proceedings arising out of plagiarism, copyright infringement, defamation, breach of confidentiality, or violation of third-party rights. The journal reserves the absolute right to reject, withdraw, retract, or remove any manuscript or published article in case of ethical or legal violations, without incurring any liability.

ISSN: 2582-6433

JUDICIAL INTERVENTION IN ARBITRATION PROCEEDINGS: BALANCING AUTONOMY AND COURT SUPERVISION

AUTHORED BY - SHREYA JAISWAL

ABSTRACT

Arbitration has emerged as one of the most significant alternative dispute resolution mechanisms for resolving commercial and contractual disputes. It offers parties flexibility, confidentiality, specialised decision-making and the possibility of faster dispute resolution than ordinary litigation. The success of arbitration, however, depends upon maintaining an appropriate balance between party autonomy and judicial supervision. Excessive judicial interference may undermine the independence and efficiency of arbitral proceedings, while the complete absence of judicial oversight may expose parties to procedural unfairness, arbitrator bias, jurisdictional errors and violations of fundamental legal principles.

In India, the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 establishes a legal framework intended to minimise judicial intervention while preserving necessary court assistance and supervision. Section 5 embodies the principle of minimal intervention, whereas Sections 8, 9, 11, 17, 34 and 37 identify important circumstances in which courts may exercise their powers. Judicial decisions have further clarified the relationship between arbitral autonomy and judicial control. Decisions such as Vidya Drolia v. Durga Trading Corporation, Bharat Aluminium Co. v. Kaiser Aluminium Technical Services Inc., and Ssangyong Engineering & Construction Co. Ltd. v. National Highways Authority of India under the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 demonstrate the judiciary's evolving approach towards arbitration.

This paper examines the statutory framework, judicial precedents, challenges and practical implications of judicial intervention in arbitration proceedings in India. It argues that courts should function as facilitators and guardians of the arbitral process rather than as appellate authorities over arbitral decisions. A balanced approach is necessary to preserve party autonomy, ensure procedural fairness, uphold the rule of law and strengthen confidence in India's arbitration system.

Keywords: Arbitration, Judicial Intervention, Party Autonomy, Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, Judicial Supervision, Arbitral Tribunal, Section 34, Alternative Dispute Resolution.

ISSN: 2582-6433

INTRODUCTION

Arbitration is a method of dispute resolution in which parties agree to submit their disputes to an independent person or tribunal, known as an arbitrator or arbitral tribunal, instead of resolving them through ordinary court proceedings. The decision of the tribunal, generally called an arbitral award, is binding upon the parties and can be enforced in accordance with law.

The increasing use of arbitration in commercial transactions, infrastructure projects, construction contracts, international trade and business agreements has made it an important component of modern dispute resolution. Businesses often prefer arbitration because it permits the selection of specialised arbitrators, offers procedural flexibility and reduces dependence on conventional litigation.

However, arbitration does not operate entirely independently of the judicial system. Courts may be required to appoint arbitrators, grant interim protection, examine jurisdictional objections in legally prescribed circumstances, set aside defective awards and assist in the enforcement of arbitral decisions. Judicial involvement is therefore necessary, but it must remain within appropriate limits.

The central issue is how to balance two competing considerations. The first is party autonomy, which allows parties to determine the method and procedure of dispute resolution. The second is judicial supervision, which ensures legality, fairness and accountability.

Excessive court intervention may delay arbitration and increase its cost, defeating its fundamental purpose. Conversely, insufficient supervision may permit procedural misconduct, unfair treatment or awards that violate the law. Therefore, an effective arbitration system requires limited but meaningful judicial oversight.

In India, the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 was enacted to consolidate and amend the law relating to domestic arbitration, international commercial arbitration and the enforcement of foreign arbitral awards, as well as conciliation. The legislation seeks to modernise dispute resolution and reduce unnecessary judicial interference.

Section 5[1] expressly restricts judicial intervention in matters governed by Part I of the Act, except where the Act itself permits it. Nevertheless, courts continue to play an important role in ensuring that arbitration remains fair, effective and legally sustainable.

[1] The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (Act 26 of 1996), s. 5.

ISSN: 2582-6433

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The principal objectives of this research are:

1. To examine the concept and importance of judicial intervention in arbitration.
2. To analyse the statutory provisions governing judicial supervision under the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.
3. To study significant judicial decisions concerning party autonomy and arbitral independence.
4. To identify the problems associated with excessive and insufficient judicial intervention.
5. To suggest measures for improving the effectiveness, fairness and efficiency of arbitration in India.

CONCEPT AND IMPORTANCE OF PARTY AUTONOMY IN ARBITRATION

Party autonomy refers to the freedom of parties to determine important aspects of their arbitration agreement and proceedings, subject to applicable law. It is one of the foundational principles of arbitration.

Parties may generally agree upon the number and method of appointment of arbitrators, the seat of arbitration, the procedural rules, the language of proceedings and the substantive law applicable to their dispute, within the limits established by law.

Party autonomy provides several advantages.

First, it allows parties to choose arbitrators possessing specialised knowledge of the relevant industry or subject matter. For example, a dispute arising from a complex construction project may be referred to an arbitrator experienced in engineering contracts.

Second, it provides procedural flexibility. Unlike ordinary civil litigation, arbitration can be organised according to the requirements of the dispute, subject to mandatory legal safeguards.

Third, it promotes efficiency by allowing parties to select procedures appropriate to the nature and complexity of their disagreements.

Fourth, party autonomy strengthens commercial certainty because parties can agree in advance on how future disputes will be resolved.

However, party autonomy is not absolute. Parties cannot use their agreement to eliminate mandatory legal protections, authorise corruption or disregard applicable principles of natural justice. An arbitral tribunal must remain independent and impartial.

ISSN: 2582-6433

Therefore, judicial supervision becomes necessary when the exercise of contractual freedom threatens fairness, legality or the integrity of the proceedings.

The objective is not to replace party autonomy with judicial control, but to ensure that autonomy operates within a legally acceptable framework.

STATUTORY FRAMEWORK GOVERNING JUDICIAL INTERVENTION

The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 establishes the circumstances in which courts may assist or supervise arbitration. Several provisions are particularly important.

- Section 5: Extent of Judicial Intervention

Section 5[2] provides that, notwithstanding anything contained in any other law, no judicial authority shall intervene in matters governed by Part I of the Act except where Part I provides otherwise.

This provision expresses the legislative preference for minimal judicial interference. It prevents courts from exercising unrestricted supervisory powers merely because a dispute is also capable of being considered through ordinary civil proceedings.

Section 5 does not completely exclude judicial involvement. Instead, it confines intervention to the circumstances recognised by the Act.

Its underlying purpose is to protect arbitral independence, prevent unnecessary litigation and ensure that arbitration remains an effective dispute resolution mechanism.

- Section 8: Reference of Parties to Arbitration

Section 8[3] requires a judicial authority to refer parties to arbitration where an action is brought concerning a matter covered by a valid arbitration agreement, provided the statutory requirements are satisfied.

This provision protects the parties' contractual choice to resolve their disputes through arbitration.

For example, if two companies enter into a contract containing a valid arbitration clause and one company subsequently files an ordinary civil suit concerning a dispute covered by that clause, the other company may seek reference to arbitration under Section 8.

The court must examine the issue within the limits established by law rather than deciding the entire contractual dispute at the referral stage.

[2] The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (Act 26 of 1996), s. 5.
[3] The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (Act 26 of 1996), s. 8.

ISSN: 2582-6433

- Section 9: Interim Measures by Courts

Section 9[4] empowers courts to grant specified interim measures before, during or after arbitral proceedings but before enforcement of the award, subject to the statutory conditions.

Such measures may include preservation of property, securing the amount in dispute, interim injunctions and other protective orders permitted by the provision.

Interim protection is important because delay in obtaining relief may cause irreparable harm or frustrate the eventual award.

For instance, if a party reasonably fears that the opposite party may dispose of assets necessary to satisfy a potential award, it may seek appropriate interim protection from a court.

However, judicial assistance under Section 9 should not become a substitute for the arbitral tribunal's authority. Once the tribunal has been constituted, the court must consider the statutory requirements concerning the availability of relief under Section 17.

- Section 11: Appointment of Arbitrators

Section 11[5] provides the framework for appointing arbitrators when the agreed appointment procedure fails or the parties cannot complete the appointment as required by law.

Judicial intervention at this stage helps prevent one party from obstructing arbitration by refusing to cooperate in the appointment process.

Nevertheless, the court's role is not to determine the merits of the underlying dispute. Its examination must remain within the limits prescribed by the applicable statutory provisions and judicial precedents.

The principle of minimal intervention requires courts to avoid conducting an extensive trial at the appointment stage.

- Section 16: Competence of the Arbitral Tribunal

Section 16[6] incorporates the principle of Kompetenz-Kompetenz, under which an arbitral tribunal may rule on its own jurisdiction, including objections concerning the existence or validity of the arbitration agreement.

This principle is essential because it allows the tribunal to examine whether it has the legal authority to decide a dispute.

If every jurisdictional objection automatically required a full court hearing before arbitration could proceed, parties could easily delay proceedings.

Section 16 therefore promotes arbitral autonomy by allowing the tribunal to address

[4] The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (Act 26 of 1996), s. 9.
[5] The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (Act 26 of 1996), s. 11.
[6] The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (Act 26 of 1996), s. 16.

ISSN: 2582-6433

jurisdictional questions in the first instance, subject to the statutory framework governing subsequent judicial review.

- Section 17: Interim Measures by the Arbitral Tribunal

Section 17[7] empowers the arbitral tribunal to grant interim measures during arbitral proceedings.

The provision strengthens the tribunal's ability to protect the subject matter of the dispute and reduces unnecessary dependence on courts.

Orders under Section 17 are enforceable in accordance with Section 17(2)[8], as if they were orders of a court.

The provision demonstrates that judicial assistance and arbitral independence can operate together. The tribunal exercises its authority, while the law provides a mechanism for enforcing its orders.

- Section 34: Setting Aside an Arbitral Award

Section 34[9] permits an application to set aside an arbitral award on specified statutory grounds. These include incapacity of a party, invalidity of the arbitration agreement, lack of proper notice or opportunity to present a case, decisions beyond the scope of submission to arbitration, improper composition or procedure, non-arbitrability and conflict with the public policy of India.

For domestic awards other than international commercial arbitration awards seated in India, the statutory framework also permits setting aside on the ground of patent illegality appearing on the face of the award, subject to the conditions and exclusions specified in Section 34(2A)[10].

Section 34 does not provide a general appeal on the merits. Courts cannot ordinarily reconsider the entire evidence or substitute their preferred interpretation merely because another conclusion appears possible.

This restriction preserves the finality of arbitral awards while allowing judicial correction of legally recognised defects.

- Section 37: Appealable Orders

Section 37[11] identifies specified orders under the Act against which an appeal may be filed.

Its scope is limited to the categories expressly provided by the legislation. It does not create a general right to appeal against every procedural decision or arbitral order.

[7] The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (Act 26 of 1996), s. 17.
[8] The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (Act 26 of 1996), s. 17(2).
[9] The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (Act 26 of 1996), s. 34.
[10] The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (Act 26 of 1996), s. 34 (2A).
[11] The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (Act 26 of 1996), s. 37.

ISSN: 2582-6433

The restricted appellate framework helps prevent repeated challenges that could otherwise undermine the efficiency of arbitration.

Taken together, these provisions establish a model in which courts provide necessary assistance and remedies without assuming routine control over arbitral proceedings.

JUDICIAL APPROACH TO ARBITRATION: LANDMARK JUDICIAL DECISIONS

The Indian judiciary has played a significant role in determining the limits of judicial intervention in arbitration. Judicial decisions demonstrate a gradual movement towards respecting arbitral autonomy while retaining the power to correct serious legal irregularities.

- Bharat Aluminium Co. v. Kaiser Aluminium Technical Services Inc. (2012)[12]

Citation: Bharat Aluminium Co. v. Kaiser Aluminium Technical Services Inc., (2012) 9 SCC 552.

This case, commonly known as the BALCO judgment, is an important decision concerning the territorial jurisdiction of Indian courts in arbitration.

The Supreme Court adopted the territoriality principle, holding that Part I of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 generally applies to arbitrations seated in India. The Court rejected the earlier approach under which Indian courts could exercise certain supervisory powers over foreign-seated arbitrations merely because the underlying contract was governed by Indian law or part of the cause of action arose in India.

The judgment strengthened the independence of international commercial arbitration and recognised the significance of the arbitral seat in determining supervisory jurisdiction.

Significance: The decision clarified the territorial limits of judicial supervision and strengthened party autonomy in selecting the seat of arbitration. Its principal approach applies prospectively to arbitration agreements covered by the judgment, subject to the legal qualifications subsequently established.

- Associate Builders v. Delhi Development Authority (2015)[13]

Citation: Associate Builders v. Delhi Development Authority, (2015) 3 SCC 49.

This judgment examined the grounds on which an arbitral award could be set aside under Section 34, particularly in relation to public policy and patent illegality.

The Supreme Court explained that a court exercising jurisdiction under Section 34 does not

[12] Bharat Aluminium Co. v. Kaiser Aluminium Technical Services Inc., (2012) 9 SCC 552 (India).
[13] Associate Builders v. Delhi Development Authority, (2015) 3 SCC 49 (India)

ISSN: 2582-6433

ordinarily function as an appellate court. It cannot freely reassess the evidence or substitute its own interpretation of the contract for a reasonable interpretation adopted by the arbitrator.

The judgment also discussed the principles of fundamental policy of Indian law, justice and morality, and patent illegality within the then-applicable statutory framework.

Subsequent amendments and later judgments have refined the scope of these grounds.

Significance: The decision established an important distinction between correcting legally recognised defects and conducting a fresh examination of the merits. It supported the principle that arbitral awards should not be disturbed merely because a court might have reached a different conclusion.

- Ssangyong Engineering & Construction Co. Ltd. v. National Highways Authority of India (2019)[14]

Citation: Ssangyong Engineering & Construction Co. Ltd. v. National Highways Authority of India, (2019) 15 SCC 131.

This case concerned the scope of judicial interference with arbitral awards following the 2015 amendments to the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.

The Supreme Court examined the restrictions imposed by the amended Section 34, particularly concerning public policy and patent illegality.

The Court emphasised that judicial review cannot be used to reopen the merits of a dispute. An award may be challenged only on legally recognised grounds, and the public policy ground cannot be interpreted so broadly that it becomes a general appeal against arbitral decisions.

The judgment also clarified that patent illegality must satisfy the statutory requirements and cannot be invoked simply because the arbitrator has committed an ordinary error of law.

Significance: The decision strengthened the finality of arbitral awards and restricted attempts to use Section 34 as a means of obtaining a second hearing on the merits.

- Vidya Drolia v. Durga Trading Corporation (2021)[15]

Citation: Vidya Drolia v. Durga Trading Corporation, (2021) 2 SCC 1.

This decision is significant for understanding arbitrability and the role of courts at the referral stage.

The Supreme Court explained the distinction between disputes that can be resolved through arbitration and those that are reserved for public adjudication or are otherwise legally non-arbitrable.

[14] Ssangyong Engineering & Construction Co. Ltd. v. National Highways Authority of India, (2019) 15 SCC 131 (India).
[15] Vidya Drolia v. Durga Trading Corporation, (2021) 2 SCC 1 (India).

ISSN: 2582-6433

The judgment also discussed the limited nature of judicial examination when a party seeks reference to arbitration. Courts should ordinarily avoid conducting a detailed inquiry into matters that can appropriately be decided by the arbitral tribunal.

However, referral to arbitration may be refused where the court finds, within the applicable legal standard, that the dispute is clearly non-arbitrable or that no valid arbitration agreement exists.

Significance: The judgment supports a restrained judicial approach and reinforces the principle that courts should not unnecessarily decide substantive disputes at the referral stage.

- Amazon com. NV Investment Holdings LLC v. Future Retail Ltd. (2021)[16]

The dispute concerned the enforceability of an emergency arbitrator's order made under the rules of the Singapore International Arbitration Centre.

The Supreme Court recognised the enforceability of the emergency arbitrator's order within the framework of the Indian Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, including Sections 2(1)(d)[17] and 17[18], as applicable to the circumstances.

The judgment recognised that institutional arbitration rules selected by the parties can form an important part of their agreed dispute resolution framework.

It also demonstrated that arbitration need not be restricted to traditional procedures involving only a permanently constituted arbitral tribunal.

Significance: The decision strengthened party autonomy and supported the use of emergency arbitration as a mechanism for obtaining urgent interim protection. It also illustrated that judicial recognition can facilitate arbitration rather than undermine it.

THE NEED FOR JUDICIAL INTERVENTION

Although minimal judicial intervention is an essential principle of arbitration, limited court supervision remains necessary for several reasons.

- Protection of Natural Justice

Arbitration must comply with the fundamental requirements of procedural fairness. Section 18[19] of the Act requires equal treatment of parties and a full opportunity to present their respective cases.

If an arbitral tribunal refuses to hear a party or conducts proceedings in a manner that seriously

[16] Amazon com. NV Investment Holdings LLC v. Future Retail Ltd. (2021) SC 3723.
[17] The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (Act 26 of 1996), s. 2 (1) (d).
[18] The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (Act 26 of 1996), s. 17.
[19] The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (Act 26 of 1996), s. 18.

ISSN: 2582-6433

violates procedural fairness, judicial intervention may become necessary through the remedies provided by the Act.

- Prevention of Arbitrator Bias

The independence and impartiality of arbitrators are essential to the credibility of arbitration. Sections 12[20] and 13[21] establish mechanisms for disclosure and challenges concerning an arbitrator's independence or impartiality.

Where a challenge is unsuccessful before the tribunal, Section 13(5)[22] generally permits the objection to be raised when an application is made to set aside the award under Section 34.

The statutory scheme seeks to prevent arbitrary decision-making while avoiding unnecessary interruption of ongoing proceedings.

- Protection of Rights Through Interim Relief

Courts may be required to protect assets, preserve evidence or prevent actions that could frustrate the eventual award.

Without effective interim relief, a successful claimant might receive an award that becomes difficult to enforce because the relevant assets have disappeared or the subject matter of the dispute has been destroyed.

PROBLEMS ARISING FROM EXCESSIVE JUDICIAL INTERVENTION

Despite the statutory objective of minimal intervention, several practical problems continue to affect arbitration in India.

First, delay in court proceedings: Applications concerning the appointment of arbitrators, interim relief and challenges to awards may consume substantial time. Repeated proceedings can undermine the objective of speedy dispute resolution.

Second, increased litigation costs: When arbitration generates extensive parallel court proceedings, parties may incur costs comparable to, or greater than, those associated with ordinary litigation.

Third, misuse of legal remedies: Parties may sometimes raise repeated objections not primarily to protect legitimate rights but to postpone an unfavourable outcome. Although genuine challenges must remain available, procedural remedies should not become instruments of obstruction.

Fourth, uncertainty in judicial interpretation: Different factual circumstances may generate

[20] The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (Act 26 of 1996), s. 12.
[21] The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (Act 26 of 1996), s. 13.
[22] The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (Act 26 of 1996), s. 13 (5).

ISSN: 2582-6433

disputes over the extent of judicial scrutiny, especially at the referral and award-challenge stages. Such uncertainty can affect commercial predictability.

Fifth, weakening of arbitral finality: If courts routinely reconsider the merits of awards, arbitration may become merely an intermediate stage before conventional litigation.

BALANCING ARBITRAL AUTONOMY WITH COURT SUPERVISION

An effective arbitration system must recognise that party autonomy and judicial supervision are complementary rather than completely opposing principles.

The appropriate balance requires courts to distinguish between legitimate supervision and unnecessary interference.

First, courts should apply the statutory standards governing referral to arbitration without conducting a full trial on the merits.

Second, interim relief should be granted where the legal requirements are satisfied, while recognising the arbitral tribunal's powers under Section 17.

Third, applications challenging arbitral awards should be confined to the grounds specified under Section 34. Courts should not reassess evidence or reinterpret contractual provisions merely because another view appears preferable.

Fourth, parties must retain meaningful remedies against bias, serious procedural unfairness and decisions exceeding the tribunal's jurisdiction.

Fifth, judicial proceedings should be conducted efficiently. Where a court is empowered to intervene, unnecessary adjournments and repetitive hearings should be avoided.

Finally, arbitration agreements and institutional rules should be drafted clearly so that disputes about the seat, appointment procedure, applicable rules and interim relief are minimised.

A balanced approach requires courts to act as facilitators of arbitration while retaining the authority necessary to protect legality and fairness.

CONCLUSION

Judicial intervention in arbitration proceedings presents a continuing challenge for modern dispute resolution. Arbitration depends upon party autonomy, procedural flexibility and the finality of arbitral awards. However, these principles cannot operate effectively without appropriate legal safeguards.

The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 attempts to establish this balance through Section

ISSN: 2582-6433

5 and other provisions governing referral, appointment, interim measures, jurisdictional objections and challenges to arbitral awards.

Judicial decisions, including BALCO, Associate Builders, Ssangyong Engineering, Vidya Drolia and Amazon.com NV Investment Holdings, demonstrate the importance of limiting judicial interference while ensuring that arbitration remains consistent with applicable law.

The central lesson emerging from the statutory framework and judicial precedents is that courts should not treat arbitration as an ordinary trial followed by a general appellate review. Instead, judicial intervention should be exercised only within the limits established by law and for legitimate purposes, such as protecting procedural fairness, preventing jurisdictional excesses and addressing legally recognised defects.

At the same time, arbitral independence cannot justify bias, denial of a fair hearing or disregard of mandatory legal requirements. Meaningful judicial supervision is therefore necessary, but it must remain proportionate to the problem requiring judicial attention.

Ultimately, the success of arbitration in India depends on a judiciary that respects party autonomy, enforces statutory limits and intervenes decisively when the law requires it. Courts should function as guardians of the arbitral process, not as routine appellate authorities over arbitral decisions. Such an approach can improve efficiency, reduce unnecessary litigation, strengthen commercial confidence and contribute to India's development as a reliable destination for domestic and international arbitration.

IJLRA