



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-25515-2024(O&M)
Date of decision: 01.10.2024

Subodh Construction Company
... Petitioner
Versus
State of Haryana and others
... Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Robin Dutt, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Ankur Mittal, Addl. AG, Haryana,
Ms. Kushaldeep Kaur, and Ms. Saanvi Singla, Advocates,
for the respondents.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

The petitioner (Subodh Construction Company) has prayed for the following substantive relief:

“Civil Writ Petition under articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of Writ in the nature of Mandamus directing the respondents to settle the dispute through Dispute Redressal System envisaged in the Standard Bidding document.

And further prayed for releasing the amount Rs.35,86,956.00 P. + 5,15,687.00 P. the total amoutn come to 41,02,653.00 alongwith interest @ 12% on the delayed payment, against the execution of work regarding the remodeling of Baroda Minor from RD No.0-47900.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that pursuant to an agreement entered into between the parties, dated September 19, 2018, the petitioner was assigned a work for remodeling of Baroda Minor from RD 0 to 47900. However, he submits, owing to certain monetary claims, a dispute between the parties had arisen. As a result, the petitioner, in terms of Clause 23 (Dispute Redressal Mechanism) of the Standard Bidding Documents, moved



the respondent-authorities to constitute a Committee for amicable resolution of the dispute. However, he submits, even though a considerable time has elapsed, but the matter has not made any tangible progress.

Served with the advance copy of the petition, Mr. Ankur Mittal, learned Additional Advocate General, Haryana is present in Court on behalf of the respondents. On instructions from the Engineer-in-Chief (respondent No.2), he submits that the matter is already under active consideration of the authorities. And the Committee, in terms of Clause 23 of SBD, shall be constituted on or before October 15, 2024. As always, he fairly submits that once the Committee is constituted, every possible endeavour shall be made to resolve the dispute amicably, if possible.

Learned counsel for the petitioner is agreeable to the course suggested by learned State counsel, and submits that let the petition be disposed of in terms of his statement.

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

(Arun Palli)
Judge

(Vikram Aggarwal)
Judge

01.10.2024
Rajan

Whether speaking / reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

YES/NO
YES/NO