

**In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh**

**C.W.P. No. 17101 of 2015**

**Date of Decision: October 16, 2015**

*Mukesh Bansal and another*

*... Petitioners*

*Versus*

*State of Haryana and another*

*... Respondents*

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARAMJEET SINGH**

Present: Mr. Johan Kumar, Advocate,  
for Mr. Gaurav Singla, Advocate,  
for the petitioners.

**Paramjeet Singh, J. (Oral)**

Instant writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents not to give effect to impugned letters dated 24.03.2015 (Annexure P/9) and 19.05.2015 (Annexure P/11) whereby the petitioners and sister concerns have been de-panelled and the contemplated action of imposition of penalty in excess of 10% beyond the terms of work order/NIT.

Brief facts of the case are that vide letter dated 27.01.2014 (Annexure P/1), the petitioner-firm was empanelled for exciting printing jobs of NRHM, Haryana. Thereafter, the petitioners continued to submit

the quotations for printing of material for NRHM, Haryana. Ultimately,  
VIRENDER KUMAR  
2015.10.20 17:50  
I attest to the accuracy and  
authenticity of this document

vide letter dated 24.02.2015 (Annexure P/7), petitioner – firm was informed that due to non-completion of supply of printing material, the office work has been affected and field health institutions have been crying for the supply of cards. In pursuance of letter dated 24.02.2015 (Annexure P/7), the petitioners filed reply which was considered by the authorities and passed the impugned orders (Annexures P/9 and P/11). Hence, the present writ petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners and perused the record.

The authorities have taken into consideration the various aspects. For health purposes, certain cards were required to be supplied which have not been supplied by the petitioner-firm well in time, resultantly, the office work and the field health institutions have been affected. Petitioners have no absolute right that they should continue on the panel in spite of the fact that they failed to perform works well in time.

In view of above, I do not find any illegality or perversity in the impugned orders.

Dismissed in limine.

**October 16, 2015**

VIRENDER KUMAR vkd  
2015.10.20 17:50  
I attest to the accuracy and  
authenticity of this document

**[Paramjeet Singh]  
Judge**