



TRHC010008362026

2026:THC:692

**HIGH COURT OF TRIPURA
AGARTALA**

WP(C) 334/2026

Sri Kajal Paul

----Petitioner(s)

Versus

The State of Tripura & 3 ors.

----Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. T. Dhar, Advocate

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Kohinoor N. Bhattacharjee, GA

**BEFORE
HON'BLE JUSTICE DR. T. AMARNATH GOUD**

Order

21/05/2026

Heard Mr. T. Dhar, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner.

2. By means of filing this writ petition, the petitioner has prayed for the following reliefs:

“i. Issue Rule upon the Respondents to show cause as to why a Writ in the nature of Mandamus and/or any other appropriate Order or Direction of like nature should not be issued, thereby directing the Respondents to forthwith process and decide the Petitioner's application, dated, 28.10.2025, for re-designation as a Class III Internal Electrical Contractor, and to issue the necessary order of re-designation in his favour upon being satisfied of his eligibility under the Rules for Enlistment of Contractors, 2019.

ii. Issue Rule upon the Respondents to show cause as to why the impugned communication bearing No. F.04(25)/EE-IED/AGT/2026-27/390, dated, 20.04.2026, issued by Respondent No. 4, returning the Petitioner's application for up-gradation without any reason and without any identification of the deficiency sought to be cured, should not be quashed and set aside as being arbitrary, unreasoned, and violative of the Petitioner's fundamental rights under Articles 14 and 19(1)(g) of the Constitution of India, and as being in violation of the principles of natural justice.

iii. Make the Rules absolute

iv. Call for the records.

v. Pass any further order or orders as this Hon'ble High Court may consider fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

3. It is the case of the petitioner-Company, that he is an enlisted Class IV internal Contractor under the PWD. As per notification dated 24.09.2019 (Annexure 2), issued by the Chief

Engineer (PWD), the petitioner has fulfilled all eligibility criteria to be re-designated as Class III Internal Electrical Contractor. Accordingly, the petitioner submitted his application praying for up-gradation of his enlistment, but the same remained un-responded by the official respondents. The petitioner on 21.08.2025 served a legal notice upon the official respondents. Again on 22.10.2025, the petitioner made formal application to the official respondents, but the same again remained un-responded. Again on 28.10.2025 and 30.03.2026, the petitioner has submitted applications before the official respondents, but received no response. Finding no other option, the petitioner again served a legal notice upon the official respondents on 03.04.2026 and upon receipt of the same, the respondent no. 4 by the impugned letter dated 20.04.2026 regretted the same asking the petitioner to resubmit all necessary documents as per rule. Feeling aggrieved, the petitioner filed this writ petition.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has fulfilled all requisite qualification in terms of notification dated 24.09.2019, issued by the Chief Engineer (PWD) and hence there is no bar on the part of the respondents to upgrade his enlistment. Learned counsel has further submitted that there is no deficiency on the part of the petitioner, but the respondents without any reason regretted the application of the petitioner rather issued the impugned letter dated 20.04.2026, and the same is required to be set-aside.

5. From the record, it is evident that several efforts were being made by the petitioner by way of submitting applications to the respondents requesting to upgrade his enlistment and according to the petitioner the same were submitted in accordance with rule. In spite of the same, by way of the impugned order, the respondents regretted the applications of the petitioner for resubmission of the same as per rule. It is the legitimate expectation of the petitioner that the respondents ought to have indicated the shortfalls in the applications of the petitioner that were made out and in respect of the rule and procedure, the petitioner has to submit his application. Since the impugned order is unreasoned, which does not disclose any information nor any infirmities, this court finds that the impugned order(Annexure-10) passed by the respondents is unjust and improper, and accordingly, the same is liable to be set aside. Since the matter has to be decided by the respondents, the matter stands remanded back to the respondents directing them to furnish the detail rules and the required documents by way of a communication to the petitioner at the earliest, preferably within two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. On receipt of the same, it is open for the petitioner to submit his letter in accordance with rule in terms of the communication of the respondents. In the event, if any such compliance is made by the petitioner, the respondents shall consider the same in accordance with law and pass a reasoned order within a period of 2(two) months thereafter.

With the above directions the instant writ petition is disposed. Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed.

JUDGE



**SAIKAT
KAR**

Digitally signed
by SAIKAT KAR
Date: 2026.05.22
13:31:58 -04'00'