

\$~29

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 9216/2017**

SARVESH SECURITY SERVICES PVT. LTD. Petitioner
Through Mr Brijender Chahar, Senior Advocate
with Mr Palan Agarwal, Ms Sneha Singh,
Mr Vishal Varddan, Advocates.
versus

SANJAY GANDHI MEMORIAL HOSPITAL
& ANR Respondents
Through Mr Sumit K. Batra, Advocate with
Mr Kapil choudhary, Advocate for R1 and R2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER
% **17.10.2017**

CM 37668/2017

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application is disposed of.

W.P.(C) 9216/2017 & CM 36667/2017

3. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, praying as under:-

“issue an appropriate writ or direction to the Respondent No.1 and respondent No.2 to grant an extension arising out of Tender ID No. 2014-SGMH-73756-1 awarded on 26.03.2015 to the Petitioner without any further delay.”

4. The petitioner is engaged in the business of providing security services. The petitioner was awarded the contract for providing security services to respondent no.1 (Sanjay Gandhi Memorial Hospital) for a term of one year with effect from 27.03.2015, pursuant to an open bidding process. The said contract has been extended from time to time. The

petitioner states that contracts with other service providers providing outsourced work have been extended; however, the petitioner apprehends that its engagement is likely to be terminated.

5. It is seen that the petitioner's contract was for a definite term which has since expired. The petitioner has no right to continue to provide the services beyond the term for which the petitioner was engaged unless the same is extended by the respondent no.1.

6. The learned counsel for the respondent no.1 states that they are in the process of finalising a fresh invitation to tender and the contract for providing security services shall be awarded on the basis of the said bids received in response to the said invitation. He further states that till the said contract is finalised, the petitioner would be called upon to continue providing services.

7. Clearly, the petitioner has no right to continue providing services indefinitely. Further, the petitioner would also be entitled to participate in any public tender that may be floated (subject to complying with the eligibility criteria).

8. In view of the said statement made on behalf of respondent no. 1 that the petitioner's services would continue till the fresh contract is finalised, no further orders are required to be passed in the present petition.

9. The petition is, accordingly, disposed of.

10. Order *dasti*.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

OCTOBER 17, 2017

pkv