

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

**JYOTI
PRAKASH
PAWAR**

Digitally signed by
JYOTI PRAKASH
PAWAR
Date: 2025.07.03
10:42:08 +0530

WRIT PETITION NO. 11199 OF 2024

Nikhil Sunil Satkar

... Petitioner

V/s.

The State of Maharashtra and Ors.

... Respondents

Mr. K.B. Borde (through V.C.) for the Petitioner

Ms. Aparna D. Vhatkar for Respondent Nos. 2,3 and 5

Ms. Neha S. Bhide, Govt. Pleader with Mr. O.A. Chandurkar, Addl.G.P with
Ms. G.R. Raghuwanshi, AGP for Respondent No.1

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

DATE : 02 JULY 2025

Order (Per Chief Justice) :

1. Heard on the question of admission.
2. In this Writ Petition, the Petitioner has assailed the validity of order dated 26 July 2024, by which the technical bid of the Petitioner has been rejected.
3. Facts giving rise to filing of this Petition briefly stated are that that the Respondent – authority issued a tender for construction of bridge at

Village Nimgaon Kalevasti, Taluka Khed, District Pune. The period of completion of contract was one year. The Petitioner submitted the bid. However, the technical bid of the Petitioner was rejected on 26 July 2024. The Petitioner, therefore, has approached this Court.

4. The learned Counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the technical bid of the Petitioner has wrongly been rejected. On the other hand, the learned Counsel for the Respondents has supported the impugned order dated 26 July 2024.

5. We have considered the submissions made by both the sides and have perused the record.

6. In relation to the mandatory conditions in the contract which have to be necessarily complied with, the Petitioner along with the tender did not annex the Geo Tagging Certificate as well as the Bank Certificate as mandated by Clause 1.12 of the Notice Inviting Tender. The Petitioner's technical bid therefore was not found to be qualified. The action of the Respondents in rejecting the technical bid of the Petitioner is just, fair and proper and is based on the criteria laid down in the tender conditions. The same by no stretch of imagination can be termed as either arbitrary or irrational.

7. For the aforementioned reasons, we do not find any merit in the Writ Petition.

8. The Writ Petition is accordingly dismissed.

(SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.)

(CHIEF JUSTICE)