

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CWP No. 13631 of 2017  
Decided on : 17.07.2017**

M/s Shine Metaltech Pvt. Ltd.

. . . Petitioner

Versus

Airport Authority of India and others

. . . Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR MITTAL  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL**

**PRESENT:** Mr. Ashwani Kumar Chopra, Sr. Advocate with  
Mr. Gursher Singh Bhandal, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*

**AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J. (Oral)**

The petitioner has approached this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seeking a writ in the nature of *Certiorari*, for quashing of communication dated May 23, 2017 (Annexure P-28), sent by respondent No.3, intimating the decision of the competent authority at CHQ, regarding cancellation of tender invited vide e-bid No. 10000018882, by Netaji Subhash Chander Bose International Airport, Kolkata for “Manufacturing, Supply and Comprehensive Annual Maintenance Contract (CAMC) of 3000 Nos. Passenger Baggage Trolleys” and communication dated May 19, 2017 (Annexure P-15), sent by respondent No.2, intimating the decision of the competent authority at CHQ, regarding cancellation of tender invited vide e-bid No. 10000019062, for “Annual rate contract for a period of two years for manufacturing, supply and comprehensive annual maintenance, contract f an estimated quantity of 7585 Nos. Passenger Baggage Trolleys (stainless steel type) for various airports” as well as the fresh tender document dated June 02, 2017, invited by the respondents for the same rate contract. A further prayer for

direction to the respondents to adhere the result of the tender process initiated in pursuance to notice inviting Tender (NIT) No.07/2016 and NIT No.AAI/TECH/KO/741/BUD/PBT/04/2016-17, issued by respondents No.2 & 3 has also been made.

2. After arguing for sometime, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has learnt that the fresh tender has been called on the request of third person, who was not qualified earlier. It was prayed by the learned counsel for the petitioner that he may be allowed to withdraw the present writ petition with liberty to the petitioner to approach the authorities concerned. It was further submitted that on the cause of action for which the present writ petition has been filed, the petitioner shall not approach this Court again.

3. Dismissed as withdrawn. It shall, however, be open to the petitioner to take recourse to the remedies as may be available to it, in accordance with law.

**(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**(AMIT RAWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**July 17, 2017**

*J.Ram*

*Whether speaking/reasoned:*  
*Whether Reportable:*

*Yes/No*  
*Yes/No*