

Suchitra

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

WRIT PETITION NO.137/2021

SUNIL G. NAIK

...PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF GOA, THR. ITS
CHIEF SECRETARY AND 2 ORS.

...RESPONDENTS

Mr. Abhay Nachinolkar, Advocate for the Petitioner.

**Mr. D. Pangam, Advocate General with Mr. Deep Shirodkar,
Additional Government Advocate for the State.**

Mr. A. D. Bhobe, Advocate for Respondent No.3.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.141/2021

GAJANAN VISHNU NAIK

...PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF GOA, THR. ITS
CHIEF SECRETARY AND 2
ORS.

...RESPONDENTS

Mr. Abhay Nachinolkar, Advocate for the Petitioner.

**Mr. D. Pangam, Advocate General with Mr. Tukaram Gawas,
Additional Government Advocate for the State.**

Mr. A. D. Bhobe, Advocate for Respondent No.3.

**CORAM: M. S. SONAK &
R. N. LADDHA, JJ.**

DATED: 31st January 2022

P.C.:

1. In both these petitions the challenge was to the award of work orders to respondent no.3 in pursuance to the tenders invited for supply of water to certain specified areas.

2. Learned Advocate General points out and it is not even disputed by the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as respondent no.3 that the tender term has since expired. Accordingly, the Advocate General is right in submitting that the reliefs in these petitions have been rendered infructuous.

3. Learned Advocate General further states that fresh tenders will be invited and the entire tender process will be positively completed within three months from today. This statement is accepted and the concerned authorities are directed to act accordingly so that the tender process is completed in all respect within three months from today.

4. In terms of our order dated 16.09.2020 an interim arrangement has been made in terms of which the petitioner in Writ Petition No.137/2021 has been supplying water at the rate specified in the order. Learned Advocate General states that this arrangement can continue for a period of three months from

today. Accordingly, this arrangement is continued for three months from today.

5. We make it clear that if for any reasons the tender process is not completed within three months from today then, the arrangement as set out in our order dated 16.09.2020 should not be continued any further. Thereafter, it will be for the State to itself make arrangements to supply water through its own agencies.

6. Mr. Nachinolkar, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has not been paid for the supplies made by him. If so, it is open to the petitioner to pursue the matter of payment with the appropriate authorities.

7. Both these petitions are disposed of in the aforesaid terms. There shall be no order for costs.

R. N. LADDHA, J.

M. S. SONAK, J.