

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP No.16401 of 2020(O&M)

Date of decision:- 07.10.2020

M/s Lakshay and Company

.....Petitioner

Versus

Gurugram Metropolitan Development Authority and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVI SHANKER JHA, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI, JUDGE.**

Present:- Mr. Naveen S.Bhardwaj, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Deepak Balyan, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana.

* * * *

RAVI SHANKER JHA, C.J. (ORAL)

With the consent of learned counsel for both the parties, the matter is being taken up and heard via video conferencing.

The petitioner has filed this petition being aggrieved by the rejection of his technical bid on the ground that he does not have similar experience for having done similar works whereas the petitioner contends that he was executing similar works for which the tender has been issued for the last six years.

Learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the State of Haryana submits that the grievance of the petitioner in respect of the rejection of his technical bid would be considered and decided by the respondent-authorities by passing a detailed reasoned order and the same shall be communicated to the petitioner before finalization of the tender proceedings.

In view of the aforesaid statement made by learned Additional Advocate General, Haryana, the petition filed by the petitioner is disposed of without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case with a direction that the petition filed by the petitioner be treated as a representation and a decision in respect of the grievances being raised therein be taken by the respondent-authorities before the tender is finalized by them as stated by the learned Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

(RAVI SHANKER JHA)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

07.10.2020

RAVINDER SHARMA
2020.10.08 17:24
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No