

S.No.7
Regular List

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH
AT SRINAGAR

WP(C) 1716/2022 CM(4197/2022)

VALLEY ENGINEERING ...Petitioner(s)/Appellant(s)
WORKS(SENIOR CITIZEN)

Through: Mr. Owais Shafi, Advocate

Vs.

UNION TERRITORY OF LADAKH AND ...Respondent(s)
ANR.

Through: Ms. Bisma Ali, Advocate vice
Mr. T.M. Shamsi, DSGI for R-1
None for respondent No.2

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE WASIM SADIQ NARGAL, JUDGE

ORDER

27-12-2025

1. By the medium of the present petition, the petitioner seeks quashment of communication dated 29th November, 2021, issued by respondent No.2, Project Director/Chief Executive Officer, Kargil Renewable Energy Development Agency (KREDA), whereby the petitioner has been blacklisted with effect from 29.11.2021 for a period of two years. Besides, the petitioner has also prayed for a direction to respondent No.2 to allow him to execute the work after issuance of a formal allotment order in his favour and to provide compensation to the tune of Rs.50 lakhs for the alleged damage caused to him on account of issuance of the impugned communication.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has drawn the attention of this Court to the communication dated 29th November, 2021, whereby

the petitioner was blacklisted for a period of two years with effect from 29.11.2021.

3. It is vehemently argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that the blacklisting of the petitioner has been effected without following the due process of law. It is further contended that although the period of blacklisting has since expired, yet the stigma attached to such blacklisting continues to haunt the petitioner and is coming in his way of participating in future tendering processes. On these grounds, learned counsel prays for quashment of the impugned communication.
4. Learned counsel appearing for respondent No.1 has also fairly submitted that he is not averse to the disposal of the petition and, for that matter, to the quashment of the impugned communication which, as per the petitioner, is coming in his way for participating in future tendering processes.
5. On 9th December, 2025, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2 submitted that with the efflux of time, the present petition has been rendered infructuous. Accordingly, respondent No.2 was directed to report instructions in the matter. Today, there is no representation on behalf of respondent No.2. The absence of representation, in the given circumstances, suggests that respondent No.2 has no serious objection to the quashment of the impugned communication.
6. Having regard to the submissions made by learned counsel appearing for the parties and in view of the fact that the period of blacklisting has already expired, coupled with the absence of any

opposition on behalf of respondent No.2 and the fair stand taken by learned counsel for respondent No.1, this Court is of the considered view that the continuance of the impugned communication would serve no useful purpose. More particularly, when the same is stated to be operating to the prejudice of the petitioner by creating a continuing stigma affecting his participation in future tendering processes.

7. Accordingly, the communication dated 29th November, 2021, issued by respondent No.2, whereby the petitioner was blacklisted, is quashed. As a necessary corollary the petitioner is free to participate in the future tendering process without any stigma, in case if there is no other legal impediment. The petitioner shall be entitled to participate in all future tendering processes and shall not be subjected to any disqualification, adverse consideration or stigma on the basis of the impugned communication, provided there exists no independent statutory or legal impediment against the petitioner.
8. The writ petition is disposed of in the above terms, along with connected applications.

(WASIM SADIQ NARGAL)
JUDGE

SRINAGAR:
27-12-2025
Mubashir