



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 23RD DAY OF JUNE, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

WRIT PETITION NO. 14866 OF 2026 (GM-TEN)

BETWEEN:

1. M/S L V TRADERS
HAVING ITS REGISTERED OFFICE:
AT JOSEPH NAGAR, BEHIND CHURCH
PROPRIETORSHIP,
WARD NO.12, SAGAR,
SHIVAMOGGA-577 401
REP. BY ITS PROPRIETRIX
SMT. KRISHNAVENI,
AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS
W/O B. PARSHURAM

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. NATARAJA BALLAL., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
SOCIAL WELFARE DEPARTMENT,
REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
VIKASA SOUDHA,
S. R. NAGARA,
BENGALURU- 560 001
2. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
KARNATAKA RESIDENTIAL
EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS SOCIETY,
BANGALORE,
NO.8, 6TH FLOOR, CUNNINGHAM ROAD,
BENGALURU-52
3. DISTRICT COMMISSIONER
SHIVAMOGGA DISTRICT
SIR M.V. ROAD, SHIVAMOGGA - 577 201.

Digitally signed
by SHWETHA
RAGHAVENDRA
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



4. KARNATAKA STATE CO-OPERATIVE
CONSUMERS FEDERATION LTD. (KSCCF),
NO. 4 PAMPAMAHAKAVI ROAD,
CHAMARAJAPET,
BANGALORE-18
REP. BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. SARITHA KULKARNI, AGA FOR R1;
SRI SRINIVASA C., ADVOCATE FOR R2 & R3;
SRI ASHOKA T., ADVOCATE FOR R4)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO (A) ISSUE A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO QUASH THE ORDER DATED 16/04/2026 BEARING NO. E-303350/KREIS/ADMN/FOOD/110/2026-ADMN PASSED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.2 (ANNEXURE-A) ONLY TO THE EXTENT OF NON-CONSIDERATION OF PETITIONER'S BID FOR TENDER NOTIFICATION BEARING NO.KERIS/2024-25/IND0030/CALL-3 DATED 17/09/2025 AND ALSO THE WORK ORDER DATED 27/04/2026 BEARING NO.E-303350/KREIS/ADMN/FOOD/110/2026-ADMN (ANNEXURE-H) AND ETC.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING IN 'B' GROUP, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

ORAL ORDER

1. The Petitioner is before this Court seeking for the following reliefs:

- (a) *Issue a writ of CERTIORARI to quash the order dated 16/04/2026 bearing no.E-303350/KREIS/ADMN/FOOD/110/2026-ADMN passed by the Respondent no.2 (Annexure-A) only to the extent of non-consideration of Petitioner's bid for Tender Notification bearing no.KERIS/2024-25/IND0030/CALL-3 dated 17/09/2025 and also the Work Order dated 27/04/2026 bearing no.E-303350/KREIS/ADMN/FOOD/110/2026-ADMN (Annexure-H);*



- (b) *Issue a writ of MANDAMUS directing the Respondent no.2 to consider the bid of the Petitioner for the Tender bearing no.KERIS /2024-25/IND0030/CALL-3 dated 17/09/2025;*
- (c) *Pass such other order or orders as this Hon'ble Court deems fit in the facts and circumstances of the case in the interest of justice and equity.*

2. The facts giving rise to the present writ petition are substantially identical to those in W.P.No.15988/2026. Hence, in order to avoid repetition, the same are not reiterated herein.
3. The sole contention advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner is that the impugned order of debarment proceeds on two distinct grounds. Firstly, it records that the petitioner violated Clause 3.7(iv) of the tender conditions by submitting a bid quoting less than 90% of the estimated tender value. Secondly, it makes reference to the issuance of the Letter of Intent (LOI) in favour of respondent No.4.
4. Learned counsel submits that while the first ground may constitute the basis for the respondents to take action, the issuance of an LOI in favour of respondent No.4 could not have been taken into consideration as a ground for debarring the petitioner. On this basis, it is contended that the impugned order is liable to be set aside.



5. I have considered the said submission and perused the impugned order as well as the material placed on record. I am unable to accept the contention advanced on behalf of the petitioner.
6. A plain reading of the impugned order makes it evident that the foundation for the petitioner's debarment is exclusively the violation of Clause 3.7(iv) of the tender conditions, namely, the submission of a bid quoting an amount below 90% of the estimated tender value, which constituted the minimum permissible bid under the tender notification. It is this admitted violation of the tender conditions that has attracted the consequence of debarment under the applicable provisions.
7. The reference in the impugned order to the issuance of the Letter of Intent in favour of respondent No.4 is merely incidental and forms part of the narration of the subsequent events in the tender process. The said reference has no bearing whatsoever on the decision to debar the petitioner. It is only after the Letter of Intent was issued to respondent No.4, the tender process attained finality, respondent No.4 furnished the requisite Bank Guarantee, and the respondents became entitled to release the Earnest Money Deposit furnished by the unsuccessful



bidders. Thus, the mention of the issuance of the Letter of Intent and the furnishing of the Bank Guarantee was only for the limited purpose of recording the circumstances under which the petitioner's Earnest Money Deposit came to be refunded. Those facts neither constitute nor form part of the reasoning underlying the order of debarment.

8. The impugned order, therefore, cannot be construed as treating the issuance of the Letter of Intent in favour of respondent No.4 as an independent or additional ground for debarring the petitioner. The debarment rests solely on the petitioner's admitted violation of Clause 3.7(iv) of the tender conditions. Consequently, no ground is made out warranting interference by this Court under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India. Accordingly, the writ petition stands ***dismissed***.

SD/-
(SURAJ GOVINDARAJ)
JUDGE

KTY
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 70