

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD
WRIT PETITION NO.6509 OF 2021**

M/S FRONTIER EX SERVICEMAN ASSOCIATION THR ITS
CHAIRMAN PRAVIN ANKUSH SONAWANE ..PETITIONER

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS ..RESPONDENTS

...

Mr. Suhas P. Urgunde, Advocate for the Petitioner.
Mr. K. N. Lokhande, AGP for Respondents-State.
Ms. Neha Kamble h/f Mr. S. V. Adwant, Advocate for
Respondent Nos.3 to 5.
Mr. V. S. Bedre, Advocate for Respondent Nos.6 to 8
and 10.

...

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA &
R. N. LADDHA, JJ.**

DATED : 22nd NOVEMBER, 2021.

PER COURT:-

1. Heard Mr. Urgunde, learned counsel for petitioner, Mr. Bedre, learned counsel respondent nos.6 to 8 and 10 and Ms. Kamble, learned counsel for respondent nos.3 to 5.

2. Mr. Urgunde, learned counsel submits that, only on the technical ground the tender of the petitioner has been rejected. No cause existed for rejecting the tender of the petitioner. The bid is rejected only on the ground that, for the months of November-2020, December-2020, January-2021 and February-2021 EPF challan has not been submitted. The learned counsel further submits that, submission of EPF challan was proper and as per terms and conditions of the tender.

3. The learned counsel further submits that, if at all there were some deficiencies, as per Government Resolution five days time is required to be accorded to the petitioner. The same was also not done.

4. The tender submitted by the petitioner was not in consonance with the conditions.

5. Mr. Bedre, learned counsel submits that, work order has been issued to respondent nos.6 to 8 and 10 on 08.04.2021. The same is for a period of only one year. Seven months have lapsed, only five months have remained. The work order is for supply of security guard.

6. Seven months have already lapsed after the work order is issued in favour of respondents. Remaining period is only of five months. At this stage it would not be appropriate to consider the petition, more particularly when it is not disclosed that, public interest would be at stake.

7. In view of the aforesaid, at this stage, we are not inclined to entertain the writ petition. Writ Petition is disposed of. No costs.

(R. N. LADDHA)
JUDGE

(S. V. GANGAPURWALA)
JUDGE