

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 12047 OF 2025

M/s. Dilip Electrical & Contractor .. Petitioner

Vs.

State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents

...

Mr. Vivekanand V. Krishnan a/w Chaitali Bhogle, Rishab Tiwari,
Advocates for the Petitioner.

Mr. O. A. Chandurkar, Addl. Government Pleader with Mr. S. H.
Kankal, AGP for the Respondent Nos. 1 to 3- State.

...

**CORAM : SHREE CHANDRASHEKHAR, CJ &
GAUTAM A. ANKHAD, J.**

DATE : 20th SEPTEMBER 2025.

P.C. :

The petitioner-Firm is aggrieved by the communication dated 29th August 2025 by which it was declared disqualified in the technical bid. According to the petitioner-Firm, it complied with the requirements of the tendering Authority's communication dated 28th July 2025 but the same was not considered. The petitioner-Firm has, therefore, approached this Court to challenge the communication dated 29th August 2025.

2. As per the procedure laid down, the petitioner-Firm was communicated with the deficiencies in its bid and one of the deficiencies was that the turn-over for last five years to the tune of a minimum Rs.80 lakhs was not furnished by the petitioner-Firm.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner-Firm refers to the response of the petitioner-Firm through communication dated

29th August 2025 and submitted that all requisite documents were furnished by the petitioner-Firm and the defects pointed out in the communication dated 28th July 2025 were rectified. However, a glance at the list of documents furnished by the petitioner-Firm discloses that it had furnished net-worth and turn-over certificate only for the financial year 2023-2024, whereas the petitioner-Firm was required to furnish the turn-over for the last five financial years. It is *ex facie* apparent that the petitioner-Firm has not complied with the tender terms and has failed to furnish all information required under the tender. Clause 3.6 of the NIT makes it clear that if the documents are not submitted, the same may result in rejection of the bid. In our view, the petitioner-Firm's bid has been rightly rejected by the respondent no.3 vide the impugned letter dated 29th August 2025. There is no merit in this petition.

4. Writ Petition No. 12047 of 2025 is dismissed.

[GAUTAM A. ANKHAD, J.]

[CHIEF JUSTICE]