

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

CWP No.9030 of 2019
Date of decision: 12.04.2019

Shivalaya Construction Company Pvt. Ltd.

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Sandeep K. Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.
Mr. Nitin Kant Setia, Advocate,
for the caveator/respondent No.4.

KRISHNA MURARI, C.J. (Oral)

Petitioner has approached this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India challenging the order dated 11.03.2019 passed by the authorities rejecting the representation made by him against holding his technical bid to be non-responsive. There are three reasons set out in the order for rejecting the technical bid by the Technical Evaluation Committee:

(1) The Bidder has not furnished its banker's details; (2) The Bidder has not furnished a copy of concession agreement with each page initialed by the person signing the bid in pursuance of the power of attorney; and (3) In the Net worth certificate furnished by the bidder the methodology for Net worth calculation is different from the one provided in the RFP.

Learned counsel for the petitioner does not dispute the fact that tender documents submitted by him lacked these details, which were required to be furnished along with the said documents. Once this is an

admitted factual position, we see no illegality in the order passed by the authorities, his technical bid has rightly been rejected and accordingly the appeal stands dismissed.

(Krishna Murari)
Chief Justice

(Arun Palli)
Judge

12.04.2019
Rajan

Whether speaking / reasoned:	YES
Whether Reportable:	NO