

HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH
AT JAMMU

LPA No. 170/2025 in
WP(C) No. 2808/2024
CM No. 5324/2025
CM No. 5326/2025
CM No. 5327/2025
Caveat No. 1464/2025
c/w
LPA No. 269/2025
CM No. 7000/2025
CM No. 7001/2025
CM No. 7752/2025

Johnson & Johnson Pvt. Ltd.

.... Petitioner/Appellant(s)

Through:- Mr. Pranav Kohli, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Ashwin Sapra, Advocate,
Mr. Farhan Mirza, Advocate and
Mr. Amjiz Maqbool, Advocate
Mr. Rahul Sharma, Advocate (LPA
No. 269/2025)

V/s

Healthium Medtech Ltd. & Ors.

.....Respondent(s)

Through:- Mr. Raman Sharma, AAG with
Ms. Jagmeet Kour, Advocate
Ms. Savita Sarna, Advocate
Mr. Varut Kumar Gupta, Advocate
Ms. Manila Mujal, Advocate

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SINDHU SHARMA, JUDGE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SEKHRI, JUDGE

ORDER
13.07.2026

LPA No. 170/2025:

1. Challenge in this appeal is to the judgment dated 02.06.2025 passed in WP(C) No.2808/2024 titled '*Healthium Medtech Limited vs. Union Territory of J&K and ors*'. The writ petition was disposed of with direction to the respondents to set aside the Minutes of Meeting dated 02.09.2024 and all consequent decisions made by respondent Nos. 2 to 4

including the rejection of bids, finalization of the contract after opening of financial bids, issuance of letters of Intent and execution of rate contracts in favour of respondent Nos. 5 & 6. Respondent Nos. 2 to 4 were also directed to initiate fresh tender process immediately upon pronouncement of judgment and also to rectify all ambiguities in the existing tender documents.

2. Learned counsel for both the parties fairly submit that the respondents have issued a fresh tender in terms of the judgment dated 02.06.2025 and have implemented the direction contained therein, therefore, nothing survives for consideration in the present Letters Patent Appeal.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant submits that the only grievance of the appellant is with regard to the observations made regarding the alleged monopoly of the appellant-company in the tendering process as stated in Paragraph Nos. 1, 39, 40, 50 and 57 of the judgment. These observations, are erroneous as the facts, regarding the same were neither pleaded nor any opportunity to rebut them was granted to the appellant.

4. We are of the considered view that since a fresh tender has been issued by the respondents/authorities and all the parties also intend to participate in the same, the judgment stands implemented. Consequently, nothing survives for adjudication in this appeal.

5. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant may be granted the liberty to approach the learned writ Court for renewal of the judgment.

6. The present Letters Patent Appeal has become infructuous and is accordingly **dismissed** with liberty to approach the learned Single Judge for review of the judgment, if so advised, in accordance with law.

LPA No. 269/2025:

1. There are some errors in the impugned judgment which require correction. However, keeping in view the fact that the fresh tender has been issued, the appellant seeks withdrawal of the instant Letters Patent Appeal with liberty to approach the learned Single Judge for correction of the judgment.

2. In view of the aforesaid submission made by learned counsel for the appellant, this Letters Patent Appeal is **dismissed** as withdrawn with liberty as prayed for.

(RAJESH SEKHRI)
Judge

(SINDHU SHARMA)
Judge

JAMMU
Amit
13.07.2026