

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPC No. 1876 of 2019**

- Tayal Tech Through It Proprietor : Ajay Agrawal, Aged About 40 Years, S/o Shri Ghanshyam Das Agrawal, R/o 2nd Floor, Tayal Technology Hub, Near Deendayal Park, Vyapar Vihar Bilaspur, Police Station Tarbahar, Tahsil Civil And Revenue District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh. Mo. No. 7697691000

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Department Of Home, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Mantralaya, Raipur Tahsil, Civil And Revenue District Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. Director General Of Police Through Additional Director General Of Police (P And P), Sector 19, Police Headquarters, Naya Raipur, Tahsil, Civil And Revenue District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
3. Medical Sensor Pvt. Ltd. 1, Shri Balajee, Hbcs Layout, Near Vidyapeeth, Opposite Gurupriya Apartment, Banashankari Iii Stage Bengaluru, Karnataka - 560085.

---- Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Shri Ratnesh Kumar Agrawal, Advocate.
For Respondent/State	:	Shri Siddharth Dubey, Deputy Government Advocate

Hon'ble Shri P. R. Ramachandra Menon, Chief Justice**Hon'ble Shri Sanjay K. Agrawal, Judge****Order on Board****Per, P. R. Ramachandra Menon, Chief Justice****26.06.2019**

1. The Petitioner has moved this Court with the following prayers:

“10.1 That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to call for entire records of the case, from the respondent authorities.

10.2 That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent No. 1 & 2 to re-evaluate the technical bid in the presence of the Petitioner and further be pleased to thereafter complete the process of tender, is in interest of justice.

10.3 That, any other relief / order which may deem fit and just in the facts and circumstances of the case including award of the costs of the petition may be given.”

2. Heard learned counsel for the Petitioner as well as learned counsel representing the State.
3. The challenge is mainly against rejection of the technical bid preferred by the Petitioner while identifying the 3rd Respondent as the eligible hand to get the fruits under the tender notified by the Respondent/State.
4. The learned counsel representing the State submits that only the 3rd Respondent came to be qualified and since there was no chance for any competitive bid, as there was only one qualified bidder, the authority concerned has taken a decision to cancel the tender and to proceed with further steps for floating a new tender. It is stated that the cause of action in the present petition does not survive in the above circumstances.
5. The writ petition is dismissed without entering into the merits of the case.

Sd/-
(P.R. Ramachandra Menon)
Chief Justice

Sd/-
(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge