

\$~28 & 29

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 3475/2016**

UNIMEDITREK PVT LTD

..... Petitioner

Through : Ms Sonal Kumar Singh and Ms Nikita
Batra, Advocates.

versus

DIRECTORT GENERAL OF THE ARMED FORCES MEDICAL
SERVICES AND ORS

..... Respondents

Through : Ms Suparna Srivastava, Advocate for
Union of India.

+ **W.P.(C) 3488/2016**

UNIMEDITREK PVT LTD

..... Petitioner

Through : Ms Sonal Kumar Singh and Ms Nikita
Batra, Advocates.

versus

DIRECTOR GENERAL OF THE ARMED FORCES MEDICAL
SERVICES (DGAFMS) & ORS

..... Respondents

Through : Ms Suparna Srivastava, Advocate for
Union of India.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BADAR DURREZ AHMED

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

ORDER

%

27.04.2016

CM No.14889/2016(exemption)in W.P.(C) 3475/2016

CM No.14947/2016(exemption) in W.P.(C) 3488/2016

Exemptions are allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 3475/2016 & CM No.14888/2016(stay)

W.P.(C) 3488/2016 & CM No.14946/2016(stay)

These writ petitions pertain to medical equipments for which tenders


2

were invited for the Pathology Department. W.P.(C) No.3475/2016 pertains to Tissue Embedding Station and W.P.(C) No.3488/2016 relates to automatic slide stainer. These equipments are to be used in the Pathology Department. The tenders were invited sometime in April, 2015 and the petitioner admittedly came to know that its bids were rejected sometime in August, 2015. Thereafter, it is the case of the petitioner that representations were moved before the concerned respondents and those have not yet been decided. On the other hand, the learned counsel appearing for the Director General of the Armed Forces Medical Services (DGAFMS), respondent No.1 herein, submitted that the successful bidders have already been selected in respect of both the equipments and Purchase Orders had been placed in November, 2015 and December, 2015. Part supply of the equipments has also been made under both the Purchase Orders.

In view of the fact that the petitioner has approached this Court after an inordinate delay and, particularly, after part supply had been made by the successful bidders, we are not inclined to entertain these writ petitions.

The writ petitions are dismissed.


BADAR DURREZ AHMED, J


SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

APRIL 27, 2016

'sn'