

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

WRIT PETITION NO. 947 OF 2016

Sangeeta Electricals & Refrigeration
Nanded

.. PETITIONER

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra
& others

.. RESPONDENTS

Mr. A.R. Rathod, advocate for petitioner.
Mr. B.V. Virdhe, AGP for the State.
Mr. S. V. Kurundkar, advocate for respondent no. 3.

=====

**CORAM : R.M. BORDE &
A.I.S. CHEEMA, JJ.
DATE : 27th JANUARY, 2016.**

PER COURT :

1. Petitioner is objecting to the tender process initiated by the Municipal Council with issuance of tender notice. Period of completion of work prescribed under the tender notice is three months. Petitioner is objecting the tender process on various grounds.

2. Learned counsel Mr. Kurundkar appears for respondent no. 3 and makes a statement on instructions that the tender of respondent no. 4 is already accepted and he has completed almost 90 percent of the work and about 80 to 85 percent amount has also been released in his favour. The Collector had initially entertained the complaint presented on behalf of Rohit Electricals, one of the bidders who participated in the tender process, however, the complaint presented has been disposed of on 27.10.2015 and the interim order granted by the District Collector has also been vacated.

3. In view of the statement made on behalf of respondent no. 3, the petition presented almost at the fag end of completion of tender work need not be entertained. Writ petition stands disposed of.

(A.I.S. CHEEMA)
JUDGE

(R. M. BORDE)
JUDGE

dyb