

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 2921 OF 2020

M/s Khurana Roadlines, Hingoli,
Through its Partner

...Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and Anr.

...Respondents

Mr S.S. Rathi, Advocate for Petitioner
Smt V.N. Patil-Jadhav, A.G.P. for Respondent Nos. 1 and 2

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA
AND
SHRIKANT D. KULKARNI, JJ.**

DATE : 9th MARCH, 2020

PER COURT :

1. We have heard the learned Counsel for the petitioner and the learned Assistant Government Pleader.

2. Mr Rathi, the learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was directed to continue with the work of transportation till regularly appointed contractor through tender process is given the work. The respondents cancelled the contract of the petitioner and now are issuing the work on ad-hoc basis through the tender for three months only. The petitioner is required to be continued with the same. According to the learned Counsel, the action of the respondent is arbitrary and does not stand to any reason.

3. The petitioner was given the work pursuant to the tender in the year 2015. The same was for three years only. The contractual period lapsed in the year 2018. The petitioner was allowed to continue the work only till the time, the fresh tender is issued. Now, the fresh tender is issued, may be for the period of three months. The petitioner does not have any vested right to claim allotment work to him till tender is issued for allotment of work for 3 to 5 years.

4. In light of the above, no case is for interference.

5. If the petitioner is eligible, then we do not find any impediment for the petitioner to participate in the fresh tender process.

6. The writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

[SHRIKANT D. KULKARNI, J.]

[S.V. GANGAPURWALA, J.]

mta