

M/s Ding Man Power Pvt. Ltd. v. State of Haryana and others

Present : Mr. Puneet Bali, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Vibhav Jain, Advocate, for applicant-respondent No.3.

Mr. Prateek Pandit, Advocate,
for the non-applicant-petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Balyan, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana.

Pursuant to our order dated 15.07.2016, respondent No.2-Municipal Corporation, Rohtak evaluated the original petitioner's technical bid. By a communication dated 27.07.2016 respondent No.2-Municipal Corporation, Rohtak informed the non-applicant-petitioner that its technical bid was not found eligible on the basis of the terms and conditions mentioned in the tender documents of respondent No.2.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner states that by a earlier communication dated 04.07.2016 respondent No.2 had accepted the petitioner's technical bid. Several contentions were raised on behalf of the petitioner as well as on behalf of each of the respondents. It is not permissible for us to go into this issue in this review application. It would be necessary for the petitioner to challenge the decision dated 27.07.2016, if it so desires. In this view of the matter we do not think it necessary to take any further affidavit on record including the affidavit which was sought to be filed on behalf of respondent No.2 pursuant to our earlier order. The same may be relied upon in any proceedings that the petitioner may adopt.

Review application is accordingly disposed of in terms of the orders passed therein including the order dated 15.07.2016. The observation regarding the payments by respondent No.2, if any, to respondent No.3 at their risk stand revoked.

(S.J.VAZIFDAR)
ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

29.07.2016
'ravinder'