GAHC010141142026

undefined

# THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
## (HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)

**Case No. : WP(C)/3587/2026**

M/S LEOTECH PROCESS
A PROPRIETORSHIP FIRM HAVING ITS PLACE OF BUSINESS AT BLOCK NO. C4, PLAT NO. 136, NEW AUTO NAGAR, KANURU, VIJAYAWADA-52000 ANDHRA PRADESH, REPRESENTED BY ITS AUTHORISED REPRESENTATIVE, JAKIR HUSSAIN.

VERSUS

THE UNION OF INDIA AND 5 ORS
REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY, TO THE DEPARTMENT OF RAILWAYS, 256-A, RAISINA ROAD, RAJPATH AREA, CENTRAL SECRETARY, NEW DELHI-110001

2:THE NORTH EAST FRONTIER RAILWAY
REPRESENTED BY THE GENERAL MANAGER
NORTH EAST FRONTIER RAILWAY
GUWAHATI
MALIGAON
KAMRUP (M)
ASSAM.

3:THE GENERAL MANAGER

NORTH EAST FRONTIER RAILWAY
GUWAHATI
MALIGAON
KAMRUP (M)
ASSAM.

4:THE PRINCIPAL CHIEF ROLLING STOCK ENGINEER

NORTH EAST FRONTIER RAILWAY

GUWAHATI
MALIGAON
KAMRUP (M)
ASSAM.

5:THE SENIOR DIVISIONAL MECHANICAL ENGINEER
LUMDING DIVISION
NORTHEAST FRONTIER RAILWAY
DRM OFFICE COMPLEX
LUMDING 782447

6:ROSE VENTURES AND M/S THARU AND SONS JOINT VENTURE
HAVING ITS OFFICE AT PARAC BUILDING
C/O THARU SONS
KATIPAYIROAD
RAJAGIRI
P.O. SOUTH KALAMASSERY
ERNAKULAM DISTRICT- ERNAKULAM
KERALA-68310

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. R. Dubey, Advocate

For the Respondent(s) : Mrs. R. Devi, CGC
: Mr. G. Rahul, Advocate

**BEFORE**
**HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DEVASHIS BARUAH**

**ORDER**

**Date : 27.08.2026**

Heard Mr. R. Dubey, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Petitioner and Ms. R. Devi, the learned CGC appearing on behalf of the Respondent Nos. 1 to 5. I have also heard Mr. G. Rahul, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Respondent No.6.

2. This Court has also taken note of the urgency shown by the

learned counsel for the Respondents stating inter alia that in view of the interim order passed by this Court, the Railway Authorities are in difficulties in distribution of linen, blankets to the passengers etc.

3. Having heard the learned counsels for the parties, it is the opinion of this Court that the Petitioner has failed to make out a case for interference with the decision of the Respondent Authorities in rejecting the Petitioner's technical bid.

4. Accordingly, the interim order passed on 15.07.2026 stands vacated.

5. The writ petition also stands dismissed.

6. Detailed order is passed in separate sheet.

**JUDGE**

**Comparing Assistant**