

\$~52

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

+ **W.P.(C) 10034/2018 & CM Nos.39150-51/2018**

FLYING ELEPHANT STUDIO Petitioner

Through: Ms. Swathi Sukumar, Advocate

versus

CENTRAL PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT (CPWD) & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Rajesh Gogna, CGSC for
respondent Nos. 1 to 3

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV KHANNA

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDER SHEKHAR

ORDER

%

25.09.2018

Appearance on advance notice is made on behalf of the respondents, and on instructions, it is stated that the first respondent would by a written communication, inform the reasons for disqualifying the petitioner. The said communication would be sent by speed post within two days, both to the petitioner as well as learned counsel for the petitioner. The communication would be also sent within two days by e-mail to the petitioner.

On receipt of the said written communication, the petitioner, if still aggrieved, would be entitled to challenge the act/decision in accordance with law.

Recording the aforesaid, we dispose of the present writ petition, as it is primarily predicated on the contention that the rejection letter dated 18.8.2018 of the first respondent is non-speaking and non-reasoned. All the

pending applications are also disposed of.

We clarify that we have not made any comments on merits or examined the reasons recorded by the respondent No.1 for treating the petitioner as unqualified. If a fresh writ petition is filed, the contentions raised by both sides would be considered and examined on merits.

Dasti.

SANJIV KHANNA, J

CHANDER SHEKHAR, J

SEPTEMBER 25, 2018/tp