

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA,
CHANDIGARH**

**CWP No. 12853 of 2016
Date of decision : June 28, 2016**

Sethi Ram

..... Petitioner

Versus

F.C.I. and others

..... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M. JEYAPPAUL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.B. CHAUDHARI**

**Present:- Mr. Manish Kumar Singla, Advocate,
for the petitioner.**

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest?

M. JEYAPPAUL, J (oral).

Heard the submissions made by learned counsel for the writ petitioner considering the nature of prayer now sought by the writ petitioner, we are of the considered view that no notice need be issued to respondents No.1 to 3.

Of course, the writ petitioner has sought a direction to the official respondents to disqualify respondent No.3 on the allegation that respondent No.3 intentionally submitted false information, while submitting tender.

We are not inclined to grant the relief as sought for by the petitioner at this stage. However, it is found that the writ petitioner has submitted a representation (Annexure P-5) to respondent No.2 on 21.06.2016 levelling such an allegation against respondent No.3 in connection with the information furnished by him while submitting tender.

Now, the grievance of the writ petitioner is that the above representation has not been disposed of before opening the technical bid.

Considering the limited prayer sought for by the writ petitioner, respondent No.2 is directed to consider and dispose of the representation (Annexure P-5) dated 21.06.2016 on merits within one week from the date of receipt of this order. The confirmation of the tender shall be subject to the outcome of the above representation made by the writ petitioner.

The writ petition stands disposed of accordingly.

(M. JEYAPPAUL)
JUDGE

(A.B. CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

28.06.2016
Dinesh