

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

902 WRIT PETITION NO. 1339 OF 2024

Savitrimai S.b. Seva Sahakari Sanstha Through Its Program Manager Akash
Ramesh Nagare

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra Through Its Principal Secretary And Others

...

Mr. A. D. Sonkawade h/f Mr. Rajesh H. Mewara - Advocate for the Petitioner

Mr. P. S. Patil – Addl.G.P. for Respondent/State

Mr. Dnyaneshwar S. Bagul – Advocate for Respondent No. 3

Mr. Nandkumar Jiwade h/f Mr. V. S. Bedre – Advocate for Respondent No. 4

...

CORAM : R. G. AVACHAT

AND

NEERAJ P. DHOTE, JJ.

DATED : 11TH JUNE, 2025

PER COURT : -

1. The Petitioner, which is a Co-operative Society, had responded to the tender issued by Respondent No. 3 for the supply of manpower for outsourcing the cleaning work of the Hospitals. The Petitioner was allotted the said work by a Work Order dated 27.04.2018, which is annexed as Exhibit 'C' to the present Petition. According to the Petitioner, the amount mentioned in the Work Order should have been excluded from GST and so the Petitioner had raised a query with Respondent No. 3 in respect of GST. However, Respondent No. 3 by the impugned communication dated 14.05.2018, blacklisted the Petitioner.

2. The learned Advocate for the Petitioner submits that, the action of blacklisting of the Petitioner was taken without giving him any opportunity of hearing and, therefore, the impugned order is bad in law. He submits that, the same be quashed and set aside.

3. The learned Advocate for Respondent Nos. 3 and 4, the contesting Respondents, does not dispute that the impugned order is completely silent that the Petitioner was given an opportunity of hearing before passing the said order.

4. In view of the above, it is needless to state that before passing the impugned order by which the Petitioner-Society has been blacklisted, the Respondent Nos. 3 and 4 ought to have afforded an opportunity of hearing to the Petitioner, which has not been done in the present case. Hence, there is a violation of principles of natural justice. Thus, the impugned communication is quashed and set aside.

5. The Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

[NEERAJ P. DHOTE]
JUDGE

[R. G. AVACHAT]
JUDGE

SG Punde