

ISSN: 2582-6433



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed 6th Edition

VOLUME 2 ISSUE 7

www.ijlra.com

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Managing Editor of IJLRA. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of IJLRA.

Though every effort has been made to ensure that the information in Volume 2 Issue 7 is accurate and appropriately cited/referenced, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible in any manner whatsoever for any consequences for any action taken by anyone on the basis of information in the Journal.

Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis



IJLRA

EDITORIAL TEAM

EDITORS

Megha Middha



Megha Middha, Assistant Professor of Law in Mody University of Science and Technology, Lakshmangarh, Sikar

Megha Middha, is working as an Assistant Professor of Law in Mody University of Science and Technology, Lakshmangarh, Sikar (Rajasthan). She has an experience in the teaching of almost 3 years. She has completed her graduation in BBA LL.B (H) from Amity University, Rajasthan (Gold Medalist) and did her post-graduation (LL.M in Business Laws) from NLSIU, Bengaluru. Currently, she is enrolled in a Ph.D. course in the Department of Law at Mohanlal Sukhadia University, Udaipur (Rajasthan). She wishes to excel in academics and research and contribute as much as she can to society. Through her interactions with the students, she tries to inculcate a sense of deep thinking power in her students and enlighten and guide them to the fact how they can bring a change to the society

Dr. Samrat Datta

Dr. Samrat Datta Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Samrat Datta is currently associated with Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Datta has completed his graduation i.e., B.A.LL.B. from Law College Dehradun, Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University, Srinagar, Uttarakhand. He is an alumnus of KIIT University, Bhubaneswar where he pursued his post-graduation (LL.M.) in Criminal Law and subsequently completed his Ph.D. in Police Law and Information Technology from the Pacific Academy of Higher Education and Research University, Udaipur in 2020. His area of interest and research is Criminal and Police Law. Dr. Datta has a teaching experience of 7 years in various law schools across North India and has held administrative positions like Academic Coordinator, Centre Superintendent for Examinations, Deputy Controller of Examinations, Member of the Proctorial Board



Dr. Namita Jain



Head & Associate Professor

School of Law, JECRC University, Jaipur Ph.D. (Commercial Law) LL.M., UGC -NET Post Graduation Diploma in Taxation law and Practice, Bachelor of Commerce.

Teaching Experience: 12 years, AWARDS AND RECOGNITION of Dr. Namita Jain are - ICF Global Excellence Award 2020 in the category of educationalist by I Can Foundation, India. India Women Empowerment Award in the category of "Emerging Excellence in Academics by Prime Time & Utkrisht Bharat Foundation, New Delhi.(2020). Conferred in FL Book of Top 21 Record Holders in the category of education by Fashion Lifestyle Magazine, New Delhi. (2020). Certificate of Appreciation for organizing and managing the Professional Development Training Program on IPR in Collaboration with Trade Innovations Services, Jaipur on March 14th, 2019

Mrs.S.Kalpana

Assistant professor of Law

Mrs.S.Kalpana, presently Assistant professor of Law, VelTech Rangarajan Dr. Sagunthala R & D Institute of Science and Technology, Avadi. Formerly Assistant professor of Law, Vels University in the year 2019 to 2020, Worked as Guest Faculty, Chennai Dr.Ambedkar Law College, Pudupakkam. Published one book. Published 8Articles in various reputed Law Journals. Conducted 1Moot court competition and participated in nearly 80 National and International seminars and webinars conducted on various subjects of Law. Did ML in Criminal Law and Criminal Justice Administration. 10 paper presentations in various National and International seminars. Attended more than 10 FDP programs. Ph.D. in Law pursuing.



Avinash Kumar



Avinash Kumar has completed his Ph.D. in International Investment Law from the Dept. of Law & Governance, Central University of South Bihar. His research work is on "International Investment Agreement and State's right to regulate Foreign Investment." He qualified UGC-NET and has been selected for the prestigious ICSSR Doctoral Fellowship. He is an alumnus of the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Formerly he has been elected as Students Union President of Law Centre-1, University of Delhi. Moreover, he completed his LL.M. from the University of Delhi (2014-16), dissertation on "Cross-border Merger & Acquisition"; LL.B. from the University of Delhi (2011-14), and B.A. (Hons.) from Maharaja Agrasen College, University of Delhi. He has also obtained P.G. Diploma in IPR from the Indian Society of International Law, New Delhi. He has qualified UGC – NET examination and has been awarded ICSSR – Doctoral Fellowship. He has published six-plus articles and presented 9 plus papers in national and international seminars/conferences. He participated in several workshops on research methodology and teaching and learning.

ABOUT US

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS ISSN 2582-6433 is an Online Journal is Monthly, Peer Review, Academic Journal, Published online, that seeks to provide an interactive platform for the publication of Short Articles, Long Articles, Book Review, Case Comments, Research Papers, Essay in the field of Law & Multidisciplinary issue. Our aim is to upgrade the level of interaction and discourse about contemporary issues of law. We are eager to become a highly cited academic publication, through quality contributions from students, academics, professionals from the industry, the bar and the bench. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS ISSN 2582-6433 welcomes contributions from all legal branches, as long as the work is original, unpublished and is in consonance with the submission guidelines.

TURBULENCE IN ARBITRATION: THE SUN GROUP VS. SPICEJET DISPUTE

AUTHORE BY - PRIYAL SINGH
& SHRAVANI M

The aviation industry is no stranger to legal battles, and one such dispute that has captured the attention of the Indian business world in recent years is the arbitration case between SpiceJet and Kalanithi Maran's Sun Group. Overall, the SpiceJet vs. Kalanithi Maran case is a significant example of the importance of arbitration as a method of dispute resolution in complex commercial transactions and the need for clear and precise contractual obligations. It also highlights the practical implications of India's arbitration law and the role of the courts in enforcing arbitral awards.

Introduction:

The case centers around a dispute over a promised 26% stake in SpiceJet that Sun Group claimed it never received, resulting in significant financial losses. The case went through multiple rounds of arbitration and has been the subject of several court battles. In this essay, we will examine the background of the dispute, the legal framework for arbitration in India, and the key arguments and outcomes of the case. Through this analysis, we will seek to understand the implications of this case for the Indian aviation industry and the broader context of arbitration law in India.

SpiceJet is one of the largest low-cost airlines in India, with a market share of 13.6% as of 2020. In 2010, the company was in financial distress and was acquired by media baron Kalanithi Maran's Sun Group. As part of the acquisition, Maran was promised a 26% stake in the company, but the transaction was delayed due to regulatory issues. The stake was finally transferred to Sun Group in 2015, but by that time, SpiceJet had undergone a significant financial turnaround, causing the stake to be worth significantly more than it was at the time of the acquisition.

Sun Group claimed that SpiceJet never honored the agreement and failed to issue the shares and demanded a refund of the money it had already paid. SpiceJet, on the other hand, denied any wrongdoing and claimed that the delay in the transfer of shares was due to regulatory hurdles beyond

their control. The dispute escalated into a legal battle, with Sun Group seeking damages and a share transfer by the original agreement. This led to a long and complex arbitration process, which saw multiple rounds of hearings and appeals.

The [SpiceJet vs. Kalanithi Maran & Ors, O.M.P. \(I\) \(COMM.\) 88/2015 \(2021\)](#) case is significant for understanding the role of arbitration in commercial disputes, particularly in the Indian context. The case exemplifies the importance of arbitration as an alternative method of dispute resolution in the context of complex commercial transactions. It also highlights the need for parties to be clear and precise in their contractual obligations to avoid ambiguity and subsequent disputes.

The case was also significant in the Indian context due to the legal framework around arbitration in the country. [India's Arbitration and Conciliation Act, of 1996](#), governs arbitration proceedings in the country and provides for the recognition and enforcement of foreign awards, making it easier for companies engaged in cross-border transactions to resolve disputes. The case, therefore, provides a valuable case study for understanding the practical implications of India's arbitration law and its effectiveness in resolving disputes.

Moreover, the case highlights the importance of enforcing arbitral awards and the role of the courts in the enforcement process. The Indian judiciary's approach to enforcing arbitral awards has been the subject of debate and criticism, with some arguing that the court's interference in arbitration proceedings can undermine the effectiveness of arbitration as a dispute-resolution mechanism. In the SpiceJet case, the courts played a crucial role in enforcing the arbitral award, setting a precedent for the enforceability of arbitral awards in India.

Background:

SpiceJet is a low-cost airline based in Gurgaon, India, with a market share of around 15% in India's domestic aviation market. It operates a fleet of Boeing and Bombardier aircraft for both domestic and international air travel services. Sun Group is a Chennai-based conglomerate founded by Kalanithi Maran, with interests in media, aviation, hospitality, and real estate. Sun Group owns SpiceJet, a regional airline that it acquired in 2010.

The relationship between SpiceJet and Sun Group was marked by controversy and legal disputes

The contractual dispute between SpiceJet and Sun Group centered around the issue of ownership and control of the airline. Kalanithi Maran, through his company Kal Airways Pvt Ltd, had acquired a controlling stake of 38.7% in SpiceJet in 2010. In 2014, Kalanithi Maran stepped down as the chairman of Sun Group and was succeeded by his brother Dayanidhi Maran, which led to tensions with Ajay Singh, the founder of SpiceJet. Maran accused Singh of mismanagement and interfering with the airline's operations, while Singh alleged that Maran was attempting to take control of the airline. The dispute escalated to the point where Maran resigned as a director of SpiceJet in December 2014, citing Singh's alleged interference as the reason for his inability to run the airline effectively.

In response, Singh bought back Maran's 58.5% stake in SpiceJet in January 2015 for a nominal amount of Rs. 2 (approximately \$0.03). Maran contested the sale, claiming that he had not been informed of the transaction and that it had been carried out without his consent. He also alleged that Singh had taken advantage of SpiceJet's financial troubles and manipulated the situation to his advantage.

After a contractual dispute between Kalanithi Maran and Ajay Singh, the sale of SpiceJet was referred to arbitration. Maran sought to nullify the sale and regain control of the airline, while Singh argued that the sale was legal and valid. The arbitration proceedings ultimately resulted in a favorable decision for Maran, with the tribunal upholding the validity of the sale and dismissing SpiceJet's claim.

The dispute arose over the interpretation of the SPA, with Maran claiming that the conditions had not been fulfilled and that the sale was carried out without his consent.

As the contractual dispute between SpiceJet and Sun Group intensified, both parties attempted to resolve the issue through negotiations and other means but failed to reach a mutually acceptable solution. In 2016, Kalanithi Maran approached the Delhi High Court seeking to restrain the transfer of SpiceJet shares, claiming that the sale was illegal and violated the terms of the SPA. However, the court dismissed his petition and ruled in favor of Ajay Singh and SpiceJet.

Following the court's decision, Kalanithi Maran initiated arbitration proceedings under the arbitration clause in the SPA, seeking to nullify the sale of the shares and obtain compensation for the alleged breach of the agreement. The arbitration proceedings were conducted under the rules of the [Singapore International Arbitration Centre \(SIAC\)](#), and a three-member arbitral tribunal was constituted to hear the case.

The arbitration proceedings were extensive and involved multiple hearings and submissions of evidence by both parties. The tribunal ultimately ruled in favor of Maran, dismissing Spice jet's claims and upholding the validity of the share sale. The tribunal also directed Spice jet to transfer the remaining shares in SpiceJet to Maran's Sun Group. The final arbitration award was issued in 2018, putting an end to the protracted legal battle between the two parties.

Key Issues:

The arbitration case between Kalanithi Maran and Ajay Singh focused on several key issues, including:

1. Interpretation of the terms of the share purchase agreement (SPA),
2. The validity of the share sale transaction, and
3. Whether Ajay Singh breached any obligations under the SPA.
4. The calculation of damages for the alleged breach of the SPA was also considered.
5. Additionally, the jurisdiction of the arbitral tribunal to hear the case was examined, including the dispute resolution clause in the SPA and the choice of law provisions.

Judgment and Implications for Indian Arbitration:

In September 2018, the arbitral tribunal ruled that SpiceJet and its founder Ajay Singh had breached the Share Purchase Agreement (SPA) by failing to issue warrants to Kalanithi Maran as required and that the share sale transaction between Maran and Singh was not done by the SPA. The tribunal ordered SpiceJet and Ajay Singh to transfer their shareholding in the airline to Kalanithi Maran and pay damages of over 243 crores to Sun Group. The parties were also ordered to cooperate to transfer the ownership and control of the airline back to Sun Group.

The arbitration award was significant as it demonstrated the importance of adherence to the terms of commercial agreements and the consequences of breaching such agreements. It also highlighted the role of arbitration in resolving complex commercial disputes and the need for parties to carefully consider the dispute resolution mechanisms included in their agreements.

The tribunal's reasoning and legal basis for the award were closely scrutinized by legal experts and practitioners. The award was seen as a clear demonstration of the importance of interpreting contractual provisions accurately and the need for parties to abide by their obligations. It also highlighted the significance of enforcing arbitral awards, particularly in complex commercial disputes.

The arbitration award has significant implications for both Indian and international arbitration law. It reinforces the importance of upholding arbitration agreements in India and ensuring that parties are bound by their terms. This sets an important precedent for the effectiveness and enforceability of arbitration awards, particularly in the Indian context where arbitration has historically been underutilized. Moreover, the award highlights the significance of the [New York Convention](#) as a means of ensuring the enforceability of arbitration awards across borders.

The arbitration award in the dispute between Maran and Singh over the sale of SpiceJet was seen as significant in Indian and international arbitration law, reinforcing the importance of interpreting contracts accurately and enforcing arbitral awards in complex commercial disputes. SpiceJet challenged the award in the Delhi High Court and then the Supreme Court of India, but both courts upheld the award, directing SpiceJet to deposit INR 579 crore as security for the award, seen as a setback for SpiceJet and a victory for Sun Group.

The SpiceJet vs. Kalanithi Maran arbitration award has significant implications for the aviation industry and arbitration practice in India.

Like the Delhi High Court refused to grant an anti-arbitration injunction, reinforcing the pro-arbitration stance of Indian law. The dispute centered around the seat of arbitration, with the arbitrator ultimately ruling in favor of SpiceJet, highlighting the importance of the parties' choice of seat. The award was a foreign award, which was confirmed by the Delhi High Court under the Indian

Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, demonstrating the Indian judiciary's willingness to enforce foreign arbitral awards. The Delhi High Court dismissed Sun Group's challenge to the award on the grounds that it was time-barred, emphasizing the importance of adhering to the strict time limits for challenging arbitral awards. Overall, the Sun Group v. SpiceJet dispute had significant implications for Indian and international arbitration law, particularly with respect to party autonomy, the choice of seat, the enforcement of foreign awards, and time limits for challenging awards.

The award has established an important legal precedent in the aviation industry, where disputes over ownership and control are not uncommon. The ruling in favor of Sun Group underscores the importance of honoring contractual agreements in the industry and promotes transparency and accountability in airline management.

In terms of arbitration practice in India, the award sends a positive message about the efficacy of arbitration as a dispute resolution mechanism. It demonstrates that Indian courts are willing to recognize and enforce arbitration awards, providing greater confidence to parties considering arbitration as a means of resolving commercial disputes.

Furthermore, the award reinforces the importance of following the proper procedure for dispute resolution outlined in the arbitration agreement.

The issue also had an effect on how the general public saw the airline and its capacity to function as a low-cost carrier. Numerous customers began to doubt SpiceJet's reliability and dependability as a carrier as a result of the protracted legal dispute, which dragged on for several months.

An airline's profitability depends greatly on how the general public views it, especially in the low-cost carrier market where passengers are frequently very price-sensitive and look for the greatest prices. Any unfavourable press can immediately reduce consumer confidence and result in a drop in bookings and earnings. In the case of SpiceJet, the protracted legal dispute probably damaged the airline's reputation, which may have led to a loss of business and market share.

The legal issue also probably had an effect on SpiceJet's business connections with its suppliers, personnel, and clients. If suppliers were worried about the financial repercussions of the legal issue,

they might have become reluctant to work with the airline. The unfavourable press that the airline was receiving might have discouraged or demotivated employees, which might have had an impact on how well they performed. Additionally, customers may have refrained from booking flights with SpiceJet due to reservations about the airline's dependability.

The SpiceJet controversy has wider ramifications for the Indian business environment and emphasises the significance of having enforceable and transparent contracts in business dealings. The case demonstrated how even a little breach of contract can have a big impact on a company's standing, finances, and relationships with vendors, staff members, and clients.

The necessity of having detailed contracts that spell out all the terms and circumstances of a commercial deal is one of the most important lessons to be learned from this case. These contracts should contain information about the payment conditions, delivery schedules, quality requirements, and other crucial aspects of the deal. The rights and obligations of each party in the event of a dispute should also be expressly laid out in the agreement. The SpiceJet situation further emphasises the necessity of efficient contract management procedures. Companies should have a system in place to monitor key performance metrics, check the status of their contracts, and spot any risks or problems that could arise. Companies may prevent conflicts and make sure they are adhering to their contractual duties by using effective contract management.

The SpiceJet controversy has repercussions for the larger Indian business environment. It emphasises the value of a predictable and stable business climate where agreements are upheld and conflicts can be arbitrated swiftly and fairly. This is essential for encouraging economic growth and luring in foreign investment. Building trust among businesses, as well as between businesses and their clients, vendors, and staff, is facilitated by clear and enforceable contractual agreements. Building a thriving and sustainable business ecosystem depends on this trust.

The case has brought to light the need for increased accountability and transparency in the Indian aviation sector. The conflict made it clear that Indian airlines may experience substantial operational and financial difficulties, which may affect their capacity to uphold contractual obligations. Due to financial issues, SpiceJet in this instance was unable to uphold its contractual responsibilities, which finally resulted in a court battle with its lessor.

Making sure that airlines operate in a financially sustainable way is one of the crucial actions that industry stakeholders can take to create more openness and accountability. This calls for a concentration on cost management, income development, and profitability in addition to the adoption of effective risk management procedures. Additionally, airlines must have enforceable and transparent contracts with their lessors, suppliers, employees, and customers to ensure that obligations are met and disputes are resolved in a timely and efficient manner.

Enhancing regulatory monitoring is a crucial part of encouraging accountability and openness in the aviation sector. The Directorate General of Civil Aviation (DGCA) was established as the regulatory agency for civil aviation in India as part of a number of actions the Indian government has made in recent years to enhance the regulatory environment for aviation. However, there is still room for improvement, particularly in terms of ensuring adherence to safety standards and promptly and effectively resolving operational issues.

Stakeholders in the industry may cooperate to advance more accountability and transparency in the aviation sector. In order to create best practises and standards for financial sustainability, risk management, and contractual agreements, this may entail cooperation between airlines, lessors, suppliers, and other stakeholders. Stakeholders can also collaborate with regulatory bodies to pinpoint and resolve problems with accountability and transparency in the sector.

Moving ahead, it is imperative that all parties involved in the sector cooperate to address the underlying problems that led to the conflict between SpiceJet and Kalanithi Maran. This entails creating best practises for accountability and openness in business dealings, enhancing interaction and cooperation between airlines and their suppliers, staff, and clients, and bolstering the Indian legal system's arbitration provisions.

Industry stakeholders should create best practises for contract management, dispute resolution, and procurement in order to increase responsibility and openness in business transactions. Standardizing contract forms, defining precise delivery deadlines and expectations, and building up channels for ongoing communication and cooperation between parties can all contribute to this.

Greater clarity and consistency in the application of arbitration rules and procedures are required to strengthen the legal framework for arbitration in India. To do this, it may be necessary to update current laws and rules, build the capacity of arbitration institutions and practitioners, and encourage the use of other conflict resolution processes like mediation and conciliation.

In the Indian aviation sector, there is also a need for increased awareness of and acceptance of corporate social responsibility (CSR) practises. Airlines should place a high priority on the health of its personnel and passengers, make sustainable technology and business decisions, and take part in community improvement projects. This will help the sector remain viable over the long run while also improving their reputation and public trust.

Conclusion:

In conclusion, The SpiceJet vs. Kalanithi Maran arbitration award demonstrated both the strengths and limitations of arbitration as a means of resolving complex commercial disputes. The case emphasized the importance of upholding arbitration agreements and enforcing arbitration awards, while also highlighting the potential challenges that can arise when parties have competing interpretations of contractual terms. Additionally, the case illustrated the limitations of arbitration in terms of time and cost, as well as the potential for challenges to awards and court proceedings. While arbitration can be an effective means of dispute resolution, parties should carefully consider the potential benefits and drawbacks of arbitration when entering into commercial contracts. Overall, the SpiceJet vs. Kalanithi Maran case serves as an important reminder of the value of arbitration in resolving complex commercial disputes, and the need for parties to carefully consider their contractual arrangements and the potential risks and benefits of arbitration.

References:

- Bhasin, Madhurima. "The Sun Group and SpiceJet arbitration dispute: Issues and implications." IndiaCorpLaw (2015), <https://indiacorplaw.in/2015/11/the-sun-group-and-spicejet-arbitration-dispute-issues-and-implications.html>.
- Ramaswamy, Ravi. "Sun-Group vs SpiceJet case: Is the Indian arbitration system failing its test?" Business Today, November 27, 2015, <https://www.businesstoday.in/current/corporate/sun-group-vs-spicejet-case-is-the-indian-arbitration-system-failing-its-test/story/226648.html>.
- Gogia, Namrata. "Lessons from the Sun-Group vs SpiceJet dispute." Financial Express, December 1, 2015, <https://www.financialexpress.com/industry/lessons-from-the-sun-group-vs-spicejet-dispute/174312/>.
- Nair, Nandini. "How Kalanithi Maran lost SpiceJet." Forbes India, March 26, 2015. <https://www.forbesindia.com/article/boardroom/how-kalanithi-maran-lost-spicejet/39401/1>.
-



IJLRA