

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE CHALLA KODANDA RAM

WRIT PETITION No.27199 OF 2017

Date 17.08.2017

Between:
S.Anasuya.

..... Petitioner

AND

The State of Telangana, rep. by Principal Secretary,
Secretariat, Housing, Hyderabad and others.

.....Respondents



HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE CHALLA KODANDA RAM

WRIT PETITION No.27199 of 2017

ORDER:

In this writ petition, petitioner alleges that though she quoted the most competitive price for execution of the work of providing Facility Management Services in Housing Board buildings of Gruhakalpa, Gaganvihar, Chandravihar and Manoranjan Complex Premises at M.J.Road, Nampally, Hyderabad, no orders have been issued to her.

When the matter came up on 16.08.2017, this Court directed the learned Standing Counsel for Telangana Housing Board to obtain instructions. Today, Sri G.Visweswar Reddy, learned Standing Counsel, made available a copy of the instructions from the Chief Engineer, Telangana Housing Board, Hyderabad, wherein it is stated as under:

“In response to the above tender notice, the following two bidders were participated in the tender.

1. M/s.Sai Laxmi Conservance
2. M/s. SSB Enterprises

The Technical bid evaluation was carried out and on evaluation only one bidder M/s.Sai Laxmi Conservance is qualified to open the price bid and accordingly the price bid was opened on 10.05.2017.

The bid of M/s. SSB Enterprises has uploaded the (i) experience certificates relating to the works executed in State/Central Government Departments or State/Central Government Undertakings in handling for only two separate properties encompassing not less than 100000.00 sq. ft. (One lakh Square Feet) (ii) No. of manpower employed on the properties for two separate properties and (iii) scope of services carried out by the Agency for two separate properties, as

against three properties. Hence the Bidder M/s. SSB Enterprises have not qualified to open the price bid.”

Sri G.Visweswar Reddy, learned Standing Counsel for Telangana Housing Board, would submit that, this being e-tender, in terms of access password provided to the petitioner, she can access to the result, particularly, she not being qualified would be evident therefrom.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that reasons for rejection were not communicated, and the respondents shall communicate the decision to the petitioner by post. Though the learned Standing Counsel submits that the result of the tender was notified in the website, no prejudice would be caused if the same is communicated to the petitioner by post as well.

The Writ Petition is, accordingly, disposed of with a direction to the respondents to communicate the reasons for rejection of the petitioner’s tender within a period of one week from today. However, petitioner is at liberty to take appropriate steps, if so advised.

Miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand dismissed. No order as to costs.

CHALLA KODANDA RAM,J

Date: 17.08.2017
 usd

