

rajshree

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CIVIL WRIT PETITION NO.12346 OF 2024

Shreenivasa Atal Naavinyapurn Sahakari	]		
Sanstha Maryadit & Anr.	]	..	Petitioners
vs.			
State of Maharashtra & Ors.	]	..	Respondents

None for the Petitioners.

Ms.Neha Bhide, GP a/w Mr.O.A. Chandurkar, Addl. GP and Mrs.G.R. Raghuwanshi, for Respondent No.1 to 3.

**CORAM : ALOK ARADHE, C.J. &
BHARATI DANGRE, J.**

DATE : 24th JANUARY, 2025.

ORDER (PER CHIEF JUSTICE) :-

1. The Petitioner in this Petition *inter alia* seeks writ of certiorari to quash the Tender Reference No.CWCD/Providing Man Power/01/2023-2024 (Tender I.D. 2024_wcdmh_1007144_1) dated 15/02/2024 as illegal, bad in law, unconstitutional.

2 It is submitted that the tender dated 15/02/2021 issued for selection of third party human resources across the State of Maharashtra for various Government Institutes under Commissionerate for Women and Child Development, is illegal, bad in law and unconstitutional.

3. The Petitioner is a Cooperative Society registered under the provisions of Maharashtra Co-operative Societies Act, 1960, whereas, Petitioner No.2 is registered under the provisions of Companies Act, 1956.

4. Respondent No.3 i.e. the Commissioner for Women and Child Development issued a tender on 15/02/2024 for selection of agencies for providing third party human resources across the State of Maharashtra to various Government Institutes, under Commissionerate WCD.

5. The Petitioner is aggrieved by Condition No.3.23 contained in the notice inviting tender.

6. When the matter is called out today, the learned AGP for Respondent Nos. 1 to 3 submitted that the work order has already been issued on 30/08/2024. However, the Petitioner has not chosen to amend the Writ Petition to challenge the validity of the aforesaid work order issued in favour of the third party.

7. In view of the aforesaid subsequent development, which has taken place during the pendency of the Petition and taking into account the fact that the Petitioner has not chosen to challenge the work order, nor has he impleaded the party in whose favour the work order has been issued and the Petition is only restricted to the challenge to the tender condition, the Petition has been rendered academic.

8. We are not inclined to examine validity of condition No.3.23.
9. In the result, Writ Petition is dismissed.

(BHARATI DANGRE, J.)

(CHIEF JUSTICE)