

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (C) No. 1347 of 2017**

M/s. Mahamaya Travels, Through its Proprietor Roopchand Manglani, aged about 45 years, S/o Shri Tolaram Manglani, R/o Shop No. 9, New Bus Stand, Shahdol, Madhya Pradesh.

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. South Eastern Coalfields Limited, through its Chairman-cum-Managing Director, South Eastern Coalfields Limited, Seepat Road, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Chief General Manager, South Eastern Coalfields Limited, Sohagpur Area, Dhanpuri, District Shahdol, Madhya Pradesh.
3. Staff Officer (E&M) South Eastern Coalfields Limited, Sohagpur Area, Dhanpuri, District Shahdol, Madhya Pradesh.
4. Poornendra Singh S/o Raghavendra Singh R/o 12/494, Near Irrigation Colony, Behind Dr. P. Tharwani, Shahdol, District Shahdol, Madhya Pradesh.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	: Shri Aditya S. Gupta and Shri Sunil Otvani, Advocates.
For Respondent/SECL	: Dr. N.K.Shukla, Senior Advocate with Shri Shailendra Sharma and Ms. Priya Mishra, Advocates.

Hon'ble Shri Thottathil B. Radhakrishnan, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Shri P. Sam Koshy, Judge.

Order on Board**Per Thottathil B. Radhakrishnan, Chief Justice****12/05/2017**

1. We have heard the learned counsel for the Petitioner and the learned counsel for the Respondents.
2. The Respondent-SECL, a government company which is a subsidiary of the Coal India Limited floated tenders for hiring buses on rental basis with Driver and Khalasi for use in the three-shifts for carrying Company's employees from a particular point to the area of operation where those employees were to be deployed. The first such tender was cancelled. The second tender was also

cancelled. The Petitioner is one who claims that he was the lowest bidder among the tenderers following the second tender. The Company had cancelled the second tender. That was never challenged. Thereby the Company's refusal to give the contract to the Petitioner who was the lowest bidder in the second tender had concluded become final. That was left unchallenged by the Petitioner. Now, the Petitioner seeks to challenge the award of the contract to the lowest tenderer following the third round of invitation of offers. His plea is that what he had quoted in the second round of tender was much lower than what is now offered by the lowest bidder following the third tender. We do not see that there is any legal right in the Petitioner which could be justiciable in any jurisdiction, much less in writ jurisdiction.

3. Under such circumstances, we cannot entertain the writ petition. The same deserves only to be dismissed.

4. In the result, the writ petition is dismissed.

Sd/-

(Thottathil B. Radhakrishnan)
CHIEF JUSTICE

Sd/-

(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE