

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH**

**CWP No.12261 of 2015**

**Date of decision:10.7.2015**

**M/s Paving Stone India Pvt. Ltd.**

**....Petitioner**

**VERSUS**

**Haryana Urban Development Authority and another**

**.....Respondents**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HEMANT GUPTA**

**HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE LISA GILL**

Present: Mr. Aman Kashyap, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Parvindra Singh Chauhan, Advocate for the  
respondents.

\*\*\*\*\*

**HEMANT GUPTA, J.(Oral)**

The challenge in the present writ petition is to a notice inviting tenders dated 03.06.2015 of laying of 80 mm thick interlocking paver block M-40 RMC Grade 10 but specified it to be KK, NITCO or NTC make.

The argument of learned counsel for the petitioner is that by virtue of such tender, they have excluded all other manufacturers who are manufacturing similar interlocking paver block and that condition of paver block from a specified manufacturer is illegal and arbitrary.

Mr. Chauhan, learned counsel for the respondent, states that a fresh tender notice will be issued in generic terms without making any reference to any particular brand or manufacturer of interlocking paver blocks.

In view of the said fact, the present writ petition is disposed of as the grievance of the petitioner stands redressed on the basis of statement of learned counsel for the respondent.

Disposed of as infructuous.

**(HEMANT GUPTA)**  
**JUDGE**

**JULY 10, 2015**  
‘D. Gulati’

**(LISA GILL)**  
**JUDGE**