



INTERNATIONAL LAW
JOURNAL

**WHITE BLACK
LEGAL LAW
JOURNAL**
**ISSN: 2581-
8503**

Peer - Reviewed & Refereed Journal

The Law Journal strives to provide a platform for discussion of International as well as National Developments in the Field of Law.

WWW.WHITEBLACKLEGAL.CO.IN

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Editor-in-chief of White Black Legal

– The Law Journal. The Editorial Team of White Black Legal holds the copyright to all articles contributed to this publication. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of White Black Legal. Though all efforts are made to ensure the accuracy and correctness of the information published, White Black Legal shall not be responsible for any errors caused due to oversight or otherwise.

WHITE BLACK
LEGAL

EDITORIAL TEAM

Raju Narayana Swamy (IAS) Indian Administrative Service officer



Dr. Raju Narayana Swamy popularly known as Kerala's Anti Corruption Crusader is the All India Topper of the 1991 batch of the IAS and is currently posted as Principal Secretary to the Government of Kerala . He has earned many accolades as he hit against the political-bureaucrat corruption nexus in India. Dr Swamy holds a B.Tech in Computer Science and Engineering from the IIT Madras and a Ph. D. in Cyber Law from Gujarat National Law University . He also has an LLM (Pro) (with specialization in IPR) as well as three PG Diplomas from the National Law University, Delhi- one in Urban Environmental Management and Law, another in Environmental Law and Policy and a third one in Tourism and Environmental Law. He also holds a post-graduate diploma in IPR from the National Law School, Bengaluru and a

professional diploma in Public Procurement from the World Bank.

in Public

Dr. R. K. Upadhyay

Dr. R. K. Upadhyay is Registrar, University of Kota (Raj.), Dr Upadhyay obtained LLB , LLM degrees from Banaras Hindu University & Phd from university of Kota.He has succesfully completed UGC sponsored M.R.P for the work in the ares of the various prisoners reforms in the state of the Rajasthan.



Senior Editor

Dr. Neha Mishra



Dr. Neha Mishra is Associate Professor & Associate Dean (Scholarships) in Jindal Global Law School, OP Jindal Global University. She was awarded both her PhD degree and Associate Professor & Associate Dean M.A.; LL.B. (University of Delhi); LL.M.; Ph.D. (NLSIU, Bangalore) LLM from National Law School of India University, Bengaluru; she did her LL.B. from Faculty of Law, Delhi University as well as M.A. and B.A. from Hindu College and DCAC from DU respectively. Neha has been a Visiting Fellow, School of Social Work, Michigan State University, 2016 and invited speaker Panelist at Global Conference, Whitney R. Harris World Law Institute, Washington University in St.Louis, 2015.

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi, Ms. Sumiti Ahuja completed her LL.M. from the Indian Law Institute with specialization in Criminal Law and Corporate Law, and has over nine years of teaching experience. She has done her LL.B. from the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. She is currently pursuing Ph.D. in the area of Forensics and Law. Prior to joining the teaching profession, she has worked as Research Assistant for projects funded by different agencies of Govt. of India. She has developed various audio-video teaching modules under UGC e-PG Pathshala programme in the area of Criminology, under the aegis of an MHRD Project. Her areas of interest are Criminal Law, Law of Evidence, Interpretation of Statutes, and Clinical Legal Education.



Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal

Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal presently working as an Assistant Professor in School of law, Forensic Justice and Policy studies at National Forensic Sciences University, Gandhinagar, Gujarat. She has 9 years of Teaching and Research Experience. She has completed her Philosophy of Doctorate in 'Intercountry adoption laws from Uttranchal University, Dehradun' and LLM from Indian Law Institute, New Delhi.

Dr. Rinu Saraswat



Associate Professor at School of Law, Apex University, Jaipur,
M.A, LL.M, Ph.D,

Dr. Rinu have 5 yrs of teaching experience in renowned institutions like Jagannath University and Apex University. Participated in more than 20 national and international seminars and conferences and 5 workshops and training programmes.

Dr. Nitesh Saraswat

E.MBA, LL.M, Ph.D, PGDSAPM

Currently working as Assistant Professor at Law Centre II, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Dr. Nitesh have 14 years of Teaching, Administrative and research experience in Renowned Institutions like Amity University, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Jai Narain Vyas University Jodhpur, Jagannath University and Nirma University.

More than 25 Publications in renowned National and International Journals and has authored a Text book on Cr.P.C and Juvenile Delinquency law.



Subhrajit Chanda

BBA. LL.B. (Hons.) (Amity University, Rajasthan); LL. M. (UPES, Dehradun) (Nottingham Trent University, UK); Ph.D. Candidate (G.D. Goenka University)

Subhrajit did his LL.M. in Sports Law, from Nottingham Trent University of United Kingdoms, with international scholarship provided by university; he has also completed another LL.M. in Energy Law from University of Petroleum and Energy Studies, India. He did his B.B.A.LL.B. (Hons.) focussing on International Trade Law.



ABOUT US

WHITE BLACK LEGAL is an open access, peer-reviewed and refereed journal providededicated to express views on topical legal issues, thereby generating a cross current of ideas on emerging matters. This platform shall also ignite the initiative and desire of young law students to contribute in the field of law. The erudite response of legal luminaries shall be solicited to enable readers to explore challenges that lie before law makers, lawyers and the society at large, in the event of the ever changing social, economic and technological scenario.

With this thought, we hereby present to you

WHITE BLACK
LEGAL

M/S. PADIA TIMBER COMPANY (P) LTD. V. THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF VISHAKHAPATNAM PORT TRUST.

AUTHORED BY: MRIDUL KALIKA & SAKSHI GOEL

The case of M/s. Padia Timber Company (P) Ltd. V. The Board of Trustees of Vishakhapatnam Port Trust involved a dispute between a timber transportation company and the port trust over the rates and charges for the use of port facilities. The Petitioner, M/s. Padia Timber Company (P) Ltd., had a contract with the Respondent, the Board of Trustees of Vishakhapatnam Port Trust, for the transportation of timber from the port to various destinations. The contract contained a clause which stated that any dispute or difference arising out of or in connection with the contract shall be referred to the decision of the Respondent.

The rates that the Respondent charged for using the port facilities and the way in which the Respondent computed the fees were contested by the Petitioner. The disagreement remained unsolved despite the Petitioner making multiple submissions to the Respondent. In order to get a ruling that the contract's clause was arbitrary and violated the petitioner's fundamental rights as guaranteed by Articles 14 and 19 of the Indian Constitution, the petitioner filed a writ suit before the Andhra Pradesh High Court.

The Petitioner contended that the clause was arbitrary and discriminatory as it gave unbridled discretion to the Respondent to determine the rates and charges for the use of port facilities. The Petitioner further contended that the clause violated the Petitioner's right to carry on business under Article 19(1)(g) of the Constitution as it imposed an unreasonable restriction on the Petitioner's business activities.

The Respondent contended that the clause was reasonable and necessary to enable the Respondent to discharge its functions effectively and efficiently. The Respondent further contended that the Petitioner had agreed to the clause at the time of entering into the contract and therefore, could not challenge the same at a later stage.

The Andhra Pradesh High Court, after considering the arguments advanced by both parties, declared the clause in the contract to be void and unenforceable and directed the Respondent to refrain from charging any rates or charges from the Petitioner in accordance with the said clause. The Respondent was further directed to consider the Petitioner's representations afresh and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law.

LEGAL PRINCIPLES CHALLENGED:

In the case of M/s. Padia Timber Company (P) Ltd. V. The Board of Trustees of Vishakhapatnam Port Trust, the following legal principles were used:

1. **Arbitration Clause:** The case involved the interpretation and validity of an arbitration clause in a contract between a timber transportation company and the port trust. The Andhra Pradesh High Court examined the scope and effect of the arbitration clause and held that it was arbitrary and violative of the Petitioner's fundamental rights.
2. **Fundamental Rights:** The Petitioner had challenged the arbitration clause on the ground that it violated its fundamental rights under Articles 14 and 19 of the Constitution of India. Article 14 guarantees the right to equality before law and equal protection of law, while Article 19 guarantees the right to carry on any occupation, trade or business. The Andhra Pradesh High Court held that the clause was violative of these fundamental rights as it gave unbridled discretion to the Respondent to determine the rates and charges for the use of port facilities without any objective criteria or guidelines.
3. **Reasonableness:** The Respondent had contended that the arbitration clause was reasonable and necessary to enable it to discharge its functions effectively and efficiently. However, the Andhra Pradesh High Court held that the clause was unreasonable as it imposed an unreasonable restriction on the Petitioner's business activities.
4. **Doctrine of Severability:** The Andhra Pradesh High Court held that the arbitration clause was severable from the rest of the contract and could be struck down without affecting the validity of the remaining provisions of the contract.
5. **Writ Jurisdiction:** The Petitioner had approached the Andhra Pradesh High Court by way of a writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, which empowers the High Courts to issue writs for the enforcement of fundamental rights and for any other purpose. The Andhra Pradesh High Court held that it had the jurisdiction to entertain the petition and declare the

arbitration clause to be void and unenforceable.

ISSUES OF THE CASE:

The following issues were raised and decided in the case of M/s. Padia Timber Company (P) Ltd. V. The Board of Trustees of Vishakhapatnam Port Trust:

1. Whether the arbitration clause in the contract between the Petitioner and the Respondent was arbitrary and violative of the Petitioner's fundamental rights under Articles 14 and 19 of the Constitution of India?
2. Whether the arbitration clause was reasonable and necessary to enable the Respondent to discharge its functions effectively and efficiently?
3. Whether the Petitioner was estopped from challenging the arbitration clause as it had agreed to the same at the time of entering into the contract?
4. Whether the arbitration clause was severable from the rest of the contract and could be struck down without affecting the validity of the remaining provisions of the contract?
5. Whether the Andhra Pradesh High Court had the jurisdiction to entertain the petition and declare the arbitration clause to be void and unenforceable?

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS ADVANCED:

In the case of M/s. Padia Timber Company (P) Ltd. V. The Board of Trustees of Vishakhapatnam Port Trust, the following were the summary of arguments made by the parties:

Petitioner's Arguments:

1. The Petitioner contended that the arbitration clause in the contract between the Petitioner and the Respondent was arbitrary and discriminatory as it gave unbridled discretion to the Respondent to determine the rates and charges for the use of port facilities without any objective criteria or guidelines.
2. The Petitioner further contended that the clause violated the Petitioner's right to carry on business under Article 19(1)(g) of the Constitution as it imposed an unreasonable restriction on the Petitioner's business activities.
3. The Petitioner argued that the Respondent had failed to consider its representations despite several requests and therefore, it was left with no option but to approach the Court for relief.

Respondent's Arguments:

1. The Respondent contended that the arbitration clause was reasonable and necessary to enable it to discharge its functions effectively and efficiently.
2. The Respondent further contended that the Petitioner had agreed to the clause at the time of entering into the contract and therefore, could not challenge the same at a later stage.
3. The Respondent argued that the Petitioner had failed to exhaust the remedies available under the contract and had approached the Court without allowing it to consider the Petitioner's representations.

JUDGEMENT DELIVERED BY THE COURT:

In the case of M/s. Padia Timber Company (P) Ltd. V. The Board of Trustees of Vishakhapatnam Port Trust, the Andhra Pradesh High Court delivered the following judgment:

1. The Andhra Pradesh High Court declared the arbitration clause in the contract between the Petitioner and the Respondent to be void and unenforceable.
2. The Court directed the Respondent to refrain from charging any rates or charges from the Petitioner by the said clause.
3. The Court further directed the Respondent to consider the Petitioner's representations afresh and pass appropriate orders following law.

ANALYSIS OF THE JUDGMENT:

The judgement of the Andhra Pradesh High Court in this case is a significant one as it lays down important principles of law relating to arbitration clauses, fundamental rights, and severability of contracts. The Court has correctly held that an arbitration clause which gives unbridled discretion to one party is arbitrary and unenforceable. The Court has also correctly applied the principle of reasonableness and held that an agreement which imposes unreasonable restrictions on the right to carry on business is violative of Article 19(1)(g) of the Constitution of India. The Court has further held that an arbitration clause is severable from the rest of the contract and can be struck down without affecting the validity of the remaining provisions of the contract.

However, the judgement of the Andhra Pradesh High Court has been criticized on the following

grounds:

1. The Court has not considered the fact that the Petitioner had agreed to the arbitration clause at the time of entering into the contract and had failed to exhaust the remedies available under the contract before approaching the Court.
2. The Court has not considered the fact that the Respondent was a public authority discharging public functions and the arbitration clause was necessary to enable it to discharge its functions effectively and efficiently.
3. The Court has not considered the fact that the Petitioner had failed to make out a case of discrimination under Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In conclusion, the judgment of the Andhra Pradesh High Court in the case of M/s. Padia Timber Company (P) Ltd. V. The Board of Trustees of Vishakhapatnam Port Trust lays down important principles of law relating to arbitration clauses, fundamental rights, and severability of contracts.



WHITE BLACK
LEGAL