

\$~20 & 21

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

%

Judgment delivered on: 13.02.2017

+ W.P.(C) 6658/2016 & CM No. 27220/2016

PARAM HANS IMPEX PVT. LTD. & ANR Petitioners

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR Respondents

+ W.P.(C) 6660/2016 & CM No. 27223/2016

AGGARWAL WEIGH BRIDGE PVT. LTD. ORS Petitioners

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR Respondents

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioners : Mr. Arvind Kr. Gupta, Mr. Rachit Gupta and Ms. A. Malik,
Adv.

For the Respondents : Mr. Santosh Kr. Tripathi, ASC with Mr. Rizwan, Adv. for R-
1
Ms. Renuka Arora, Mr. Kunal Kohli and Mr. Abhishek Pundir,
Adv. for DSIIDC

CORAM:-

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

JUDGMENT

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner, by the present petition, had sought quashing of Notice Inviting Tender bearing No. NIT/01/2016-17 issued by the

respondent no. 2 whereby the respondent no. 2 was proposing to set up weigh bridges on its own. The petitioner had contended that since designated sites were available for setting up weigh bridges, the respondent should have invited tenders from third parties to set up weigh bridges.

2. Learned counsel for the Respondent no. 2 submits that the said Respondent has filed affidavit dated 01.12.2016 and an additional affidavit dated 08.02.2017. Both the affidavits stated have been filed are not on record. In case the same have not been placed on record and returned under objection on the ground that the same were filed late, the delay in filing the affidavits is condoned. Counsel is directed to have the same placed on record. Copies of the affidavits have been produced in court and are taken on record.

3. Learned counsel for respondent no. 2 submits that respondents have, at the present, dropped the proposal of setting up weigh bridges on its own and has decided to auction the vacant plots for setting up of weigh bridges.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in view of the stand of the respondent no. 2, the petitioner does not press the present petition any further.

5. In view of the above, the writ petition is dismissed as not pressed.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

FEBRUARY 13, 2017
‘rs’