



HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

Writ Petition Misc. Bench No. 621 of 2026

10 August, 2026

M/s Unipro Techno Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd.

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Uttarakhand & Others

--Respondents

Presence:-

Mr. Pooran Singh Rawat, learned counsel for the petitioner.

Mr. Sachin Mohan, learned Standing Counsel and Mr. M.S. Bisht, learned Brief Holder for the State

Mr. Pankaj Chaturvedi, learned counsel (through V.C.) and Ms. Neeti Rana, learned counsel for Uttarakhand Jal Sansthan/respondent nos.2 to 7

JUDGMENT : (per Mr. Manoj Kumar Gupta, C. J.)

1. By means of the present writ petition, the petitioner has assailed the orders dated 18.07.2026 and 17.07.2026 and minutes of meeting dated 23.06.2026 pertaining to the contract for designing, building, operating and maintenance of Kaulagarh Water Supply Scheme at District Dehradun under AMRUT-2 Mission.

2. On 05.08.2026, the following order was passed:-

“1. Mr. Pooran Singh Rawat, learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. Mr. Ranjan Ghildiyal and Ms. Pooja Banga, learned Standing Counsel for the State.

3. Mr. Pankaj Chaturvedi and Ms. Neeti Rana, learned counsel for the respondent nos.2 to 7.

4. Mr. Sandeep Kothari, learned counsel for the respondent no.8.

5. Uttarakhand Jal Sansthan invited bids for the work named: Design, Build and five year Operation and Maintenance of KAULAGARH Water Supply Scheme, District Dehradun under



Amrut-2.0 Program. The present dispute relates to the 4th round of tender process, in which, the sole bid of respondent no.8 has been found to be responsive, but which is higher by almost Rs.10 Crores than the L-1 bid of the petitioner in the 3rd round. The Department had cancelled the 3rd round of the bidding process for reasons well known to it, although, in the said round, two bids were found to be responsive, namely, that of the petitioner and respondent no.8 and the bid of the petitioner was L-1. Although, we are aware of the provision that if the tender process is not concluded in the 1st round, then the Department has power to accept even a single bid, but the fact that L-1 is Rs. 10 Crores more than the L-1 bid of the petitioner in the 3rd round, requires consideration of the financial interest and other relevant factors to decide, whether the L-1 bid should be accepted. One more noteworthy feature is that the present bid of R-8 is almost Rs. 9 Crores higher than the bid made by it in the 3rd round of the tender process.

6. Learned State Counsel submits that the Department is yet to take decision as to whether sole bid of R-8, which is higher by more than Rs. 10 Crores, should be accepted or the tender process should be cancelled and fresh tenders should be invited. He seeks time till tomorrow to clarify the stand of the Department in this regard.

7. Accordingly, the matter is adjourned.

8. Put up as fresh on 06.08.2026 to enable learned State Counsel to place on record the stand of the Department."

3. When the matter is taken up today, learned State Counsel has placed on record an order issued by Chief General Manager, Uttarakhand Jal Sansthan dated 07.08.2026, by which he has accepted the recommendation of the Committee and has cancelled the entire tender process initiated in pursuance of e-advertisement dated 14.05.2026. He has also directed for initiation of fresh tender process.



4. In view of the aforesaid decision of the Chief General Manager, Uttarakhand Jal Sansthan, the cause espoused in the writ petition does not survive. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of as having become infructuous.

5. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of accordingly.

(MANOJ KUMAR GUPTA, C. J.)

(SUBHASH UPADHYAY, J.)

Dated: 10.08.2026

Rajni