

\$~46

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

%

Judgment delivered on: 08.05.2017

+ W.P.(C) 3820/2017 & CM No.16817/2017 (stay)

BEDI AND BEDI ASSOCIATES Petitioner

versus

NATIONAL BAL BHAWAN Respondent

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioner: Mr. Amit Anand Tiwari with Ms. Vishakha,
Advocates.

For the Respondent: Mr. S. Rajappa, Advocate.

**CORAM:-
HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA**

**JUDGMENT
08.05.2017**

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner, by the present petition, impugns letter dated 28.04.2017, whereby, the respondent has terminated the contract for cleaning and housekeeping services awarded to the petitioner and has forfeited the performance security in addition to blacklisting and debarring the petitioner from future tenders in the respondent institution.

2. It is contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner that no

show cause notice was given to the petitioner prior to termination of the contract and blacklisting the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that insofar as the issue of termination is concerned, the petitioner would like to avail of all his remedies in law and would not like to press the present petition.

4. Insofar as the blacklisting is concerned, he submits that since the blacklisting and debarment order was issued without issuance of any show cause notice, the order of blacklisting and debarment is vitiated.

5. Learned counsel for the respondent, who appears on advance notice, submits that insofar as the issue of blacklisting is concerned, if the petitioner represents against it, the respondent would reconsider the same.

6. He further submits that another agency has already been deployed with effect from 01.05.2017. He produces a letter dated 07.05.2017, which is taken on record.

7. In view of the above, the writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn, insofar as the prayer of termination and forfeiture of performance security is concerned, reserving liberty of the petitioner to avail of all such remedies as may be available in law.

8. In view of the above, the impugned order dated 28.04.2017, insofar as it relates to blacklisting and debarment of the petitioner is

concerned, is set aside. The respondent is directed to issue a show cause notice to the petitioner within a period of one week. The petitioner shall be granted one week time to respond to the show cause notice. The petitioner shall also be afforded an opportunity of personal hearing. The respondent would thereafter decide on the show cause notice on the issue of blacklisting and debarment within a period of two weeks.

9. Needless to state that, in case the petitioner is further aggrieved by any further orders of the respondent, the petitioner would be entitled to avail of such remedies as may be available in law.

10. The writ petition is, accordingly, disposed of.

11. *Dasti* under the signatures of the Court Master.

MAY 08, 2017
st

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J