

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

**CWP No.17983 of 2019
Date of decision: 08.07.2019**

M/s S. Ram Manpower Private Limited

... 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. Sanjeev Kodan, Advocate, for the petitioner.

KRISHNA MURARI, C.J. (Oral)

Notice of motion to respondents No.1 to 3 only, at this stage.

Mr. Samarth Sagar, learned Additional Advocate General, Haryana, who is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3. Copies furnished.

In the nature of order we propose to pass in the matter, no formal written statements/counter affidavits on behalf of the respondents are indeed necessary, at this stage. Thus, with the consent of the parties, the petition is being final disposed of.

Respondent No.3, i.e., Civil Surgeon, Rohtak, invited tender for "Out Sourcing of Support Services and Additional Support Services" for District Civil Hospital, Rohtak. Petitioner along with others as also respondent No.4 submitted their respective bids. The petitioner and respondent No.4 were found to be technically compliant. However, the limited grievance that the petitioner has is that even though the financial bid

submitted by the petitioner inclusive of all costs i.e. Rs.7446.52 per person, was the lowest and lower than respondent No.4, whose bid was Rs.7467.72 per person, the respondent-authorities have finalized the tender in favour of respondent No.4. Whereas, the petitioner being L1 ought to have been assigned the contract. It is urged that being aggrieved the petitioner had even represented to the respondents vide representation dated 28.06.2019 (Annexure P13) in this regard, but to no avail.

In response, learned State counsel submits that let this petition be disposed of, at this stage, only with a direction to respondent-authorities to consider and deal with his grievances and concerns raised in the representation dated 28.06.2019, in the first instance.

In the wake of the above, and without commenting upon the merits of the issue, we rather consider it expedient to dispose of this petition with a direction to respondents No.1 to 3 to consider and decide the representation alleged to have been submitted by the petitioner, if pending before the authorities, within a period of two weeks from today. Needless to assert that the authorities, after affording an opportunity of hearing to all the stakeholders, shall pass a comprehensive order assigning reasons in support thereof.

(Krishna Murari)
Chief Justice

(Arun Palli)
Judge

08.07.2019
Rajan

Whether speaking / reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

YES
NO