



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-21992-2024(O&M)
Date of decision: 03.09.2024

Ajay Pal
... Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab and others
... Respondents

CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI
HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present: Mr. Nitin Kaushal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.
Mr. Vipin Pal Yadav, Addl. AG, Punjab.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

The respondent-authorities had invited e-tenders for Labour and Cartage of Foodgrains and Stock Articles for Clusters at Nawanshahr, Jadla, Rahon, Eadh, Banga and Bahram. The petitioner too participated in the tendering process and submitted his bid(s). However, upon technical evaluation, vide order dated August 30, 2024, he was declared non-responsive/non-compliant. Resultantly, in terms of Clause 17 of the Punjab Foodgrains Labour & Cartage Policy, 2024, he preferred an appeal, which is pending before the Director, Food Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs, Punjab (respondent No.2). It is submitted that although the petitioner had filed first appeal on September 1, 2024 (P-4), and not much time has elapsed since then, but in the meanwhile, the respondents have invited e-tenders for the remaining clusters as well. And, the closing date to submit the bid(s) is September 5, 2024. In fact, he submits, even qua the cluster(s) for which the petitioner had submitted bid(s), the respondents have invited fresh tenders. Thus, the order vide which the petitioner was declared ineligible would gravely impair his rights/interest if the Appellate Authority does not deal/decide his appeal at the earliest.



Served with the advance copy of the petition, Mr. Vipin Pal Yadav, learned Additional Advocate General, Punjab is present in Court on behalf of the respondents. At the outset, on instructions, he submits for the Appellate Authority is already in *seisin* of the appeal, and in the given circumstances, it would make every possible endeavour to decide the matter by tomorrow. After hearing the petitioner and the other stakeholders.

That being so, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that nothing substantive survives in the petition, and the same be disposed of in terms of the statement made by learned State counsel.

In the wake of the position sketched out above, as also the statements made by learned counsel for the parties, the petition is accordingly disposed of.

This Court is sanguine that the Appellate Authority shall consider/examine the matter in the right earnest, and as submitted by learned State counsel, would pass the necessary orders within the stipulated period.

(Arun Palli)
Judge

(Vikram Aggarwal)
Judge

03.09.2024
Rajan

Whether speaking / reasoned:	YES/NO
Whether Reportable:	YES/NO