

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CWP-7790-2022 (O&M)
Date of decision:- 19.04.2022

Pawan Kumar Garg

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

U.T. Chandigarh through its Administrator, Sector 9, U.T.
Secretariat, Chandigarh and others

...Respondent(s)

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

Present: Mr. Baltej Singh Sidhu, Senior Advocate,
with Mr. Arshdeep Singh Sra, Advocate,
and Mr. Chandan Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Aman Bahri, Additional Standing Counsel,
and Mr. Prateek Rathee, Advocate,
for respondent No. 1 – U.T., Chandigarh.

Mr. Vishal Gupta, Advocate,
for respondent No. 2.

* * * *

RAVI SHANKER JHA, C.J. (ORAL)

This writ petition has been filed by the petitioner being aggrieved by the award of contract dated 13.01.2022 (Annexure P-7) in favour of respondent No. 3 for ferrying/running of solar boat at Sukhna Lake, Sector-1, Chandigarh.

From a perusal of the facts, it appears that the petitioner was a person who was awarded the contract previously which period is over including the extension and that subsequently, the respondent-authorities have taken e-tender proceedings pursuant to which the contract has been awarded to respondent No. 3. It is also evident from the fact that the petitioner was not even a participant in the e-tender proceedings and, therefore, he being a stranger to the same, the present writ petition is not maintainable.

Learned senior counsel for the petitioner, when confronted with the aforesaid, submits that he has already filed a representation dated 21.03.2022 (Annexure P-16) before the respondent-authorities alleging that respondent No. 3, to whom the contract has been awarded, is not eligible as per terms of the contract and that he has obtained a forged and fabricated experience certificate dated 12.03.2022 (Annexure P-9). He further submits that

let the representation filed by the petitioner be considered and decided by the respondent-authorities in a time bound manner.

Learned counsel, appearing for respondent No. 2, submits that the allegations of the petitioner are false and incorrect as they have already got the matter examined from the authority issuing experience certificate vide their letter dated 16.02.2022 (Annexure P-11). He, however, submits that the respondent-authorities would respond to the petitioner’s representation by taking a decision thereon expeditiously and communicating the same to him accordingly.

In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, without entering into the merits of the case and entertaining the writ petition, the same is disposed of in terms of the statement made by learned senior counsel for the petitioner as well as learned counsel for respondent No. 2.

(RAVI SHANKER JHA)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

19.04.2022
Amodh

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