

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY.
BENCH AT AURANGABAD.

958 WRIT PETITION NO.11379 OF 2018
WITH
CA/1418/2019

BALDEV CONSTRUCTIONS SANGAMNER
THROUGH PROPRIETOR VIVEK EKNATH
PANSARE

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

.....

Mr. D.P.Palodkar, Advocate for Petitioner.

Mr. P.S.Patil, AGP for R - 1 to 4 - State.

Mr. A.R.Syed, Advocate for R – 5.

Mr. S.P.Salgare, Advocate for R – 6.

.....

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA &
A. M. DHAVAL, JJ.**

DATE : 25/01/2019

.....

ORAL ORDER:

. Heard learned counsel for petitioner, learned A.G.P. for respondent Nos. 1 to 4 and learned counsel for respondent No. 5.

2. The petitioner challenges the rejection of his technical bid. The technical bid was rejected on three counts i.e. discrepancy Nos. 8,17 and 26. It appears that the petitioner had complied with two deficiencies and the proof of ownership of tipper was not submitted. The bid was to be submitted in tune with the advertisement. Offer will have to be given in the manner given in the tender document. The terms and conditions in the tender very specifically provided that the bidder must be the owner of the tipper and as such the document of ownership was necessary.

3. In light of the above, there is no flaw in rejecting the offer of the petitioner.

4. In view of the above, Writ Petition is dismissed. In view of dismissal of Writ Petition, civil application stands disposed of.

[A.M.DHAVALA]
JUDGE

[S.V.GANGAPURWALA]
JUDGE

KNP.