



2025:AHC-1 KO:85987-12H

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

WRIT - C No. - 12524 of 2025

Jagdamba Singh

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. Thru. Prin. Secy. Nagar Vikas
Lucknow And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Satyam Mishra, Upendra Kumar Sagar
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: C.S.C., Shailendra Singh Chauhan

Court No. - 2

**HON'BLE MRS. SANGEETA CHANDRA, J.
HON'BLE AMITABH KUMAR RAI, J.**

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Standing Counsel, who appears on behalf of State-respondent No.1 and Shri Shailendra Singh Chauhan, learned counsel for respondent Nos.2 to 4.

2. This petition has been filed with the following prayers :-

"(i) To issue writ, order or direction in the nature of certiorari quashing the letter/mail dated 13.12.2025 (ANNEXURE NO.2) passed by opposite parties, whereby the petitioner's application for E-Tender was rejected on the basis of Tender Terms and Conditions Point No.8.7 during Technical Evaluation of the Application.

(ii) To issue writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus thereby directing the opposite party No.2, 3 and 4 to consider the application form in which the petitioner fulfilled and completed all the necessary conditions mentioned in the notification dated 16.10.2025 and allot the tender accordingly to the eligible candidates.

(iii) Issue any other order or direction, as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper under the facts and circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioner.

(iv) Allow the petition with costs."

3. It has been submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the notice inviting tender for 13 parking sites had been issued by the Nagar Nigam on 16.10.2025. The petitioner participated in the tender process and submitted his technical bid and financial bid. His technical bid has been rejected by the

Committee on the ground that two cases are pending against him. One such case relates to the Data Protection Act and the case has, in fact, been disposed of upon deposit of Rs.1,000/- as penalty by the petitioner. The other case is a civil dispute relating to recovery of Rs.1,23,821/- for a broken side mirror of a car, which is pending before the Saket District Court, Delhi. Despite the nature of the cases being such that they ought to have been ignored, they have not been ignored and the application has been rejected during technical evaluation by the Nagar Nigam arbitrarily.

4. Shri Shailendra Singh Chauhan has read out paragraph No. 8.7 of the tender terms and conditions, which clearly provides that two affidavits are to be filed by every bidder- one relating to the non-pendency of any case in any criminal court in the country and the other relating to not having been declared a defaulter in cases of parking facilities having been allotted to such applicant by any other authority or State Government within the country. The petitioner's affidavit, a copy of which has been filed as Annexure-2 to the writ petition, clearly reveals that only one affidavit relating to the civil case, as aforesaid, has been filed. No separate affidavit has been filed.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that he has filed two separate affidavits as required under paragraph 8.7 of the tender terms and conditions. There are no pleadings in the writ petition in this regard.

6. The writ petition stands **disposed of**, in view of the stand taken by the Nagar Nigam not being found to be arbitrary by this Court.

(Amitabh Kumar Rai,J.) (Mrs. Sangeeta Chandra,J.)

December 18, 2025

Shubhankar