

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.VINOD CHANDRAN

MONDAY, THE 27TH DAY OF JULY 2015/5TH SRAVANA, 1937

WP(C).No. 20903 of 2015 (K)

PETITIONER(S):

**VENKITESH SREENIVAS, S/O.VENKATESH,
AGED 40 YEARS, NO.105, 14TH D CROSS ROAD,
2ND STAGE, 2ND PHASE, WOC ROAD,
MAHALAKSHMIPURAM, BANGALURU-86.**

**BY ADVS.SRI.P.SREEKUMAR,
SRI.SOORAJ T.ELENJICKAL,
SRI.S.PRASANTH,
SMT.P.M.MAZNA MANSOOR.**

RESPONDENT(S):

- 1. STATE OF KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY,
PRINTING AND STATIONARY DEPARTMENT,
GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 001.**
- 2. SECRETARY GENERAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT,
GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 001.**
- 3. MANAGING DIRECTOR,
KERALA BOOKS AND PUBLISHING SOCIETY,
KAKKANAD, ERNAKULAM-682 030.**

**R1 & R2 BY GOVT. PLEADER SMT.C.K. SHERIN.
R3 BY SRI.K.ANAND, SENIOR ADVOCATE.
ADV. SMT.LATHA KRISHNAN, SC.**

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 27-07-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

rs.

WP(C).No. 20903 of 2015 (K)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:-

EXT.P1 COPY OF THE REQUEST SUBMITTED BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT.

**EXT.P2 COPY OF THE PETITION DATED 09/07/2015 SUBMITTED BEFORE
THE 3RD RESPONDENT.**

RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS:- NIL.

//TRUE COPY//

P.A. TO JUDGE

rs.

K. VINOD CHANDRAN, J.

W.P.(C) No. 20903 of 2015 (K)

Dated this the 27th day of July, 2015

J U D G M E N T

The petitioner is the Director of a firm which is said to have applied in pursuance to a tender notification published by the State of Kerala, for printing text books. The petitioner's tender was lower than that accepted, and even the successful tenderer was not awarded the work, since, later the tender itself stood cancelled. The petitioner does not challenge any of that.

2. Subsequently, the petitioner is said to have approached the Chief Minister and the Minister of Education, finding that the printing was entrusted to the 3rd respondent. The petitioner also claims to have expressed his willingness to carry out the work at the rate applicable to the 3rd respondent, on condition of the transportation being provided by the Government. Such an offer presumably was made pursuant to a direction issued by this

Court in one of the writ petitions, which challenged the cancellation of the tender as such. The petitioner was also called in the negotiations directed by this Court and another Firm had offered better terms than the petitioner. In such circumstance, this Court had permitted the Government and the 3rd respondent to hand over a portion of the printing work to that other Firm.

3. In any event, now the entire work is over and there can be no grievance raised on that count and there could also be no direction now issued for entrusting the work of printing text books to the petitioner.

The writ petition hence would stand dismissed in limine.

Sd/-
K.VINOD CHANDRAN,
JUDGE