

273

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH.

CWP-23466-2021 (O&M).
Decided on: January 10, 2023.

Deepak Achint

.. Petitioner

VERSUS

Union of India and others

.. Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

PRESENT None for the petitioner.

Mr. Yatinder Sharma, Advocate, for
Mr. Sahil Garg, Advocate, for respondent No.1

Mr. Rohit Kaushik, Advocate, for respondents No.2 to 5.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

The present writ petition has been filed for seeking issuance of directions to the respondents to allot the registration No.CH-01-CG-0022 in the name of the petitioner after considering the bid of the petitioner as the last legal final highest bid.

As per the averments contained in the writ petition, the petitioner purchased a new car and approached the respondent Registering and Licensing Authorities for participating in the E-auction for issuance of registration number of his choice. The petitioner after fulfilling the necessary requirements participated in the bidding process that was held on 06.11.2021. It has been pleaded by the petitioner that on 08.11.2021, the

petitioner had submitted his highest bid against the aforesaid registration number and that the same bid being the highest bid, the registration number ought to have been allotted to him whereas the respondent authorities have allotted the said registration number in favour of respondent No.6.

Written statement on behalf to respondents No.2 to 5 has been filed wherein the specific stand of the respondents is as under:-

“3. That the petitioner had applied for participating in e-auction for choice registration number 0022 in new series CH01CG on 05.11.2021 After examining the documents of petitioner the application had been approved by the office of answering for participating in the e-auction/bidding. It is pertinent to mention here that as the web-based e-auction portal has been developed by the National Informatics Centre (NIC) under the aegis of Ministry of Road Transport & Highways, New Delhi and the said portal functions with hours, seconds and milliseconds. As per the record the petitioner had made his bid for amounting to Rs. 42,000/- at 04:59:23 and whereas Ms. Anjna Kumra had made bid for amounting to Rs.60,000/- at 04:59:28. Accordingly, the portal had not considered the bid of petitioner and registration number in question had been allotted to highest bidder namely Anjna Kumra. Screen report showing competition of bid between petitioner and other participants is appended herewith as Annexure-RI.”

Learned counsel for respondents No.2 to 5 places reliance on the aforesaid averments and the supported documents to contends that the petitioner had submitted the bid of Rs.42,000/- at 04:59:23 whereas respondent No.6 had submitted her bid for an amount of Rs.60,000/- at

04:59:28 and as such, respondent No.6 was the highest bidder and registration number has rightly been released in favour of respondent No.6 instead of the petitioner. Even though the aforesaid written statement was filed way back in March 2022, no replication controverting the aforesaid factual aspect made by respondents No.2 to 5 has been filed in Court till date.

In view of the aforesaid uncontroverted stand of the respondents, this Court has no other option but to infer that the petitioner was not the highest bidder in the said auction process and that respondent No.6 who is the highest bidder has rightly been allotted the registration number.

There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner today as well. It seems that the petitioner is no interested in pursuing the instant writ petition and the same is accordingly dismissed for want of prosecution.

January 10, 2023.
raj arora

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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