

Jvs.

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO. 8438 OF 2024

JAYANT
VISHWANATH
SALUNKE

Digitally signed by
JAYANT
VISHWANATH
SALUNKE
Date: 2025.06.13
18:28:56 +0530

Bhumi Green Energy	}	Petitioner
versus		
The State of Maharashtra & Ors.	}	Respondents

Mr. Vikram N. Walawalkar i/b. Mr. Amey C. Sawant for petitioner.

Mr. O. A. Chandurkar, Additional Government Pleader with Mr. S. H. Kankal, AGP for respondent no. 1.

Mr. Vishwanath Patil with Ms. Nidhi Chauhan for respondent no. 2 (PMC).

Mr. Onkar Warange for respondent no. 3.

**CORAM: ALOK ARADHE, CJ. &
SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.**

DATE: JUNE 13, 2025

ORDER: (Per Chief Justice)

- 1.** Heard learned counsel for the parties.
- 2.** Rule. Rule is made returnable forthwith. By consent of learned counsel for the parties, heard finally.
- 3.** In this writ petition, the petitioner, *inter alia*, seeks quashment of a communication dated 27th March 2024 as well as corrigendum dated 5th April 2024 and a letter dated 7th May 2024.

4. The grievance of the petitioner in this petition is that the technical bid submitted by it has been rejected on a baseless ground that the signature of the Power of Attorney of the petitioner on the affidavit submitted by it regarding non-inclusion of the name of the petitioner in the blacklist is not visible.

5. Facts giving rise to filing of the writ petition, briefly stated, are that on 14th February 2024, a tender was floated by the Solid Waste Management Unit of Pune Municipal Corporation for setting up a 75 MTPD Material Recovery Facility along with its operation and maintenance for a period of 10+5 years at Handewadi, Pune. In response to the aforesaid notice inviting tender, the petitioner as well as respondent no. 3 submitted their bids. The petitioner, vide a communication dated 27th March 2024 was informed that its technical bid has been rejected on the ground that the signature of the Power of Attorney of the petitioner on the affidavit submitted by it regarding non-inclusion of the name of the petitioner in the black-list is not visible. On the aforesaid factual background, this petition has been filed.

6. During the pendency of the petition, work order was issued in favour of respondent no. 3. The petitioner, thereupon, amended the writ petition.

7. We have heard learned counsel for the parties at length and have carefully gone through the averments made in the writ petition.

8. Neither in the writ petition nor in the amended petition, the petitioner has stated that it was a L-1 bidder. Therefore,

there is no need to examine the issue with regard to validity of the impugned communication dated 27th March 2024 disqualifying the bid of the petitioner as the aforesaid exercise has been rendered academic in the facts and circumstances of the case.

9. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

(SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.)

(CHIEF JUSTICE)