

D/L.335.
November 28, 2025.
KAUSHIK

WPA No. 3505 of 2025

M/s. TC Enterprises
Vs.
Steel Authority of India Limited (SAIL) and
Others

Ms. Narinder Kaur
... for the petitioner-in-person.

Mr. Arijit Basu
... for the respondent nos. 2 to 5.

This writ petition has been filed seeking issuance of a writ of mandamus commanding the respondent no. 3 *“to provide the list of students with their names and identities in respect of the vehicle transporting the students of Route-II in reference to the work order dated 18.11.2023 forthwith”* and also *“to make due payment of the petitioner”*.

The case of the petitioner is that a work order dated November 18, 2023 had been issued in the name of the petitioner upon the petitioner's successful qualification in a tender process initiated on August 3, 2023 for engagement of school buses and vans for being used for the purpose of collecting school going children from various locations/points of Ramnagar Colliery SAIL – Collieries Division. In terms of the work order, the petitioner's vehicle had been engaged for being plied on “Route-II” i.e., for collecting

students from various locations/points at Ramnagar Colliery and transporting them to Barakar Jorao Devi School to Begunia High School to Kulti Girls & Kulti Boys School and back". The petitioner contends that no list of the students that the petitioner had to transport was provided to the petitioner by the respondent SAIL Authorities despite several requests.

It is the petitioner's case that since no list was provided, the petitioner was not able ascertain as to whether the school going children who boarded the petitioner's vehicles were from Ramnagar Colliery SAIL – Collieries Division or not and that being so even local school going children used to avail the vehicle in respect of Route-II, thereby causing serious trouble for the petitioner in executing the work order. A list of students was therefore necessary but the respondents did not provide the same despite repeated requests. Hence the writ petition.

On November 21, 2025 when the writ petition was taken up, time was prayed for on behalf of the petitioner. The matter is thus being taken today.

Today Ms. Narinder Kaur, the sole proprietor of the petitioner appears in person and submits that her learned Advocate has returned the brief to her. She submits that the

Respondents have acted arbitrarily in not providing the list of students sought for by her despite repeated requests.

The learned advocate appearing for the respondent nos. 2 to 5 submits that there was no clause in the NIT or the work order whereunder a list could be supplied to the petitioner therefore the writ petition should not be entertained. It is further submitted that the work order issued by the respondents to the petitioner has expired with efflux of time. It is pointed out that the work order was issued on November 18, 2023 with a validity period of 530 days (annexure 'P-5' at page 84) and the same is not longer subsisting and as such no order can be passed in this writ petition.

Ms. Narinder Kaur appearing in person submits that the petitioner is entitled to compensation as the petitioner has suffered damages due to non-supply of the names of students. She submits that by not supplying the list of students to the petitioner, the petitioner was in effect forced to ply the vehicle with more students than intended by the work order.

Such allegation of the petitioner is however refuted by the learned counsel appearing for the respondent.

It is noticed that in the present writ petition the petitioner has prayed for a direction upon the

Respondent No. 3 to provide a list of the students and to “*make due payment of the petitioner*”. The tenor of the writ petition as evident from its pleadings as well as the submissions of Ms. Kaur indicate that the prayer for “due payment” relates to compensation for damages. However, this Court is of the view that this Court is not the appropriate forum for deciding any such issue.

Since the work order dated November 18, 2023 has lost its validity, therefore, direction for providing the list of students as sought for would at this stage be meaningless. As regards the prayer for “due payment” be it in the nature of compensation or otherwise, this Court is of the view that the same should be made by the petitioner in a properly constituted civil suit as that would entail an enquiry into disputed questions of facts.

Accordingly, WPA 3505 of 2025 is disposed of without passing any order as prayed for.

It is clarified that this order shall not prevent the petitioner from taking such legal steps and availing such legal remedy including institution of civil suit, as may be available to the petitioner, in accordance with law, for the purpose of claiming appropriate reliefs including compensation.

Since no affidavits have been invited, allegations made in the writ petition shall be deemed not to have been admitted.

There shall, however, be no order as to costs.

(Om Narayan Rai, J.)