

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.R.RAMACHANDRA MENON

TUESDAY, THE 7TH DAY OF APRIL 2015/17TH CHAITHRA, 1937

WP(C).No. 10945 of 2015 (P)

PETITIONER:

**SSA ENTERPRISES, CC-2366C,
2ND FLOOR, MUDAVATHIL BUILDING,
GEETHANJALI JUNCTION, THAMMANAM,
ERNAKULAM DISTRICT,
REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING PARTNER,
SURESH M.S., S/O.AYYAPPAN.**

**BY ADVS.SRI.BABU S. NAIR
SMT.SMITHA BABU
SRI.P.A.RAJESH
SRI.K.RAKESH
SRI.R.RANJITH (K/489/2011)
SMT.M.LISHA**

RESPONDENT(S):

- 1. THE GREATER COCHIN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
KADAVANTHRA P.O., COCHIN, - 682 020.**
- 2. THE GENERAL MANAGER,
FEDERAL BANK LTD., FEDERAL TOWERS,
MARINE DRIVE, COCHIN, PIN - 682 031.**

R1 BY SRI.C.A.MAJEED, SC

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 07-04-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

mbr/

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS:

- EXT.P1. TRUE COPY OF THE TENDER CONDITIONS ISSUED BY THE
FIRST RESPONDENT DATED NIL.
- EXT.P2. TRUE COPY OF THE DEMAND DRAFT SUBMITTED BY THE
PETITIONER DATED 12/3/2015.
- EXT.P3. TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION SUBMITTED BY THE
PETITIONER ON 20/3/2015 BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT.
- EXT.P4. TRUE COPY OF THE ACKNOWLEDGMENT SHOWING THE RECEIPT OF
EXT.P3.

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS:

- NIL

/TRUE COPY/

P.S. TO JUDGE

mbr/

P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON, J.

.....
W.P.(C)No.10945 OF 2015
.....

Dated this the 7th day of April, 2015

J U D G M E N T

The grievance of the petitioner is mainly with regard to the laxity on the part of the respondents in finalizing the tender with regard to parking in front of the Federal Tower situated at Marine Drive.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had submitted the bid pursuant to the tender floated by the first respondent in that regard, apart from participating in the auction. On completing the procedural formalities, it was revealed that the tender quoted by the petitioner was the highest, being for a sum of Rs.7,50,000/-, whereas, the amount bid/quoted by the 2nd respondent (Rs.7,09,000/-) happened to be less than the said amount quoted by the petitioner. This being the position, the tender has to be finalized in the name of the petitioner. But the proceedings

are still to be finalized, enabling the petitioner to enter into an agreement and to collect the parking fees. This made the petitioner to approach this Court.

3. During the course of the hearing, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the first respondent has permitted the 2nd respondent to park their vehicles in the area and that the proceedings are simply being protracted.

4. The learned Standing Counsel appearing for the 1st respondent submits that steps are being taken to have the tender proceedings finalized. It is also stated that the G.C.D.A has not given any right to the 2nd respondent to collect any parking fees and that no culpable delay is there on the part of the first respondent, adding that the time taken is only for completing the procedural formalities.

5. After hearing both the sides, this Court finds that the proceedings have to be take a logical conclusion. Accordingly, there will be a direction to the 1st respondent to finalize the proceedings at the earliest at any rate, within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment.

6. The petitioner shall produce a copy of this judgment along with a copy of the writ petition before the 1st respondent for further steps.

The writ petition is disposed of accordingly.

Sd/-

P.R.RAMACHANDRA MENON
JUDGE

//true copy//

P.S. to Judge

St/-