

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

Civil Writ Petition No.21049 of 2018 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 23.08.2018

Varinder Sood

.....Petitioner

versus

Union Territory, Chandigarh and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE KRISHNA MURARI, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI, JUDGE**

Present : Ms. Prabhjot Kaur, Advocate, for the petitioner.

KRISHNA MURARI, C.J.(oral)

Petitioner has approached this Court by filing the instant writ petition seeking the following main relief:-

“Issue a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing of order/letter dated 01.08.2018 passed by respondent Nos.3 to 5 whereby respondent No.6 was allotted tender of supply of manpower and also quashing of order/letter dated 01.08.2018 whereby the eligibility of the petitioner firm was shown as disqualified, is erroneous, baseless and against the facts on record and law on the subject matter”.

2. Petitioner is proprietor of M/s Moonlight Housing Keeping which is engaged in the business of providing manpower to various organizations, institutions and authorities. It is claimed that he has already worked with respondent No.3 college for supplying manpower for house keeping job from 2009 to 2014 and thereafter from 2016 till 31.07.2018.

3. Admittedly, fresh tenders were invited by respondent No.3, in pursuance whereof, the petitioner was also an applicant. It appears that the technical bid of the petitioner was rejected, as such he stood disqualified and his financial bid was not considered and the tender was allotted to respondent No.6. The allotment of work contract in favour of respondent No.6 on the basis of the bid offered by him has been challenged by the petitioner mainly on the ground that the bid submitted by him was in violation of the terms and conditions of the tender notice.

4. In our considered opinion, the petitioner will have no locus to challenge the allotment of work contract to respondent No.6 inasmuch as once his technical bid was rejected and he was disqualified which was not challenged by him and allowed the same to attain finality, as such he was excluded from the consideration zone.

5. Once the petitioner lacks locus to challenge the allotment of work in favour of respondent No.6, there is no other option but to dismiss the writ petition. The petition accordingly stands dismissed.

(KRISHNA MURARI)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

23.08.2018

ravinder

Whether speaking/reasoned	√Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No√