

\$~1

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P. (C) 4537/2020**

SANYOG HEALTHCARE LIMITED

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Mukesh Anand and
Mr. Deepak Vohra, Advocates

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Vikram Jetly, CGSC for
respondent No.1/UOI.

Mr. Aman Lekhi, Senior Advocate(ASG)
with Mr. M.S. Vinaik, Ms. Anjali Sharma
and Mr. Sharat Kapoor, Advocates for
respondents No.2 and 3.

Mr. Alok Kumar, Mr. Abhishek Paruthi and
Mr. Amit Kumar Singh, Advocates for
respondent No.4.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HIMA KOHLI

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD

ORDER

%

11.08.2020

HEARD THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCING

C.Ms.No.18598 & 18681/2020 (exemption)

Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C).4537/2020 and CM.No.18596/2020(by respondents No.2 and 3 for direction) & CM. No. 18680/2020 (by respondent No.4 for modification/variation of the order dated 04.08.2020).

1. At the outset, we have requested Mr. Anand, the learned counsel for the petitioner to confirm as to whether he has received copies of the applications moved by the respondents No.2 & 3/SAIL and respondent No.4. He states that he has received a copy of CM.No.18680/2020 filed by respondent No.4, but he has not received a copy of the application moved by respondents No.2 and 3/SAIL (CM.No.18596/2020).
2. In any case, by and large, the averments made by the respondents No.2 and 3/SAIL and the respondent No.4 in the applications are similar. The said respondents have stated in clear terms that the petitioner had been debarred by Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU) under due intimation to it, in writing as also through e-mail. In the above circumstances, we have serious reservations in entertaining the present writ petition.
3. Mr. Lekhi, learned ASG appearing for the respondents No.2 & 3/SAIL states that the petitioner has misrepresented to the court that no work order had been issued in favour of the respondent No.4. In fact the work order was issued on 14.07.2020 in term of Clause 21 of the tender documents.
4. In response, Mr. Anand states that as per his instructions, the petitioner did not receive the written communication or the e-mail from JNU, Delhi. In any case, he states that the petitioner is withdrawing the petition while reserving its right to challenge the debarment order dated 18.05.2020 issued by JNU, Delhi.

5. While refraining from making any observations on the merits/ demerits of the case of the petitioner *qua* the debarment order issued by JNU, Delhi, leave as prayed for, is granted.
6. The present petition is disposed of, along with the pending applications. The interim order stands vacated.
7. The next date fixed in the matter stands cancelled.

HIMA KOHLI, J

SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD, J

AUGUST 11, 2020
pst