



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-28826-2024(O&M)
Date of decision: 23.10.2024

The Saleempur Co-op Labour & Construction Society Ltd.
... Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab and others
... Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Abhinav Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.
Mr. Vipin Pal Yadav, Addl. AG, Punjab.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

The Municipal Council, Urmur Tanda (Hoshiarpur) had invited tenders to execute 42 works of different nature/character. The petitioner, who was also one of the participants/tenderers, submitted its bids for 10 works. However, upon technical evaluation of bids, the authorities declared the petitioner non-responsive/ineligible. For, it failed to comply with condition No.12 of the Tender Documents. Thus, this petition.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits, for the petitioner, in compliance to condition No.12 (at page 24 of the paper-book), had appended the ***Latest Nakal Mata*** with Resolution No. & date (Resolution of Co-op L&C Society), for participation in the tendering process of the concerned ULB, the decision taken by the Tender Evaluation Committee is apparently erroneous. He submits that prior to the institution of this petition, the petitioner had even served the respondent-authorities with a representation dated October 17, 2024 (P-6), as regards its concerns/grievances, but to no avail.

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, he submits that since the respondent-authorities are already in *seisin* of the representation(s) alleged to have been submitted by the petitioner, it shall be expedient if this petition is disposed of, at this stage,



to enable the competent authority to consider the concerns/grievances of the petitioner. And pass appropriate orders, in accordance with law. Further, he fairly submits that before any formal decision is reached by the concerned authority, the works for which the petitioner has submitted its bids would not be assigned to any successful tenderer.

Learned counsel for the petitioner is agreeable to the course suggested by learned Additional Advocate General, Punjab. However, he submits, for the matter is time sensitive, the authorities be directed to take a decision within a specified time.

In response, learned Additional Advocate General, Punjab submits that necessary orders shall be passed within a week from today.

In the wake of the position sketched out above, and in terms of the statements made by learned counsel for the parties, the petition stands disposed of. This Court is sanguine that the respondent-authorities shall consider the matter in the right earnest, and pass the appropriate orders in accordance with law.

Needless to assert that this order shall not constitute any expression of opinion on the merits of the case of either party, for, as indicated above, the competent authority shall examine the concerns/grievances of the petitioner, strictly in accordance with law.

(Arun Palli)
Judge

(Vikram Aggarwal)
Judge

23.10.2024
Rajan

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