



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
NAGPUR BENCH, AT NAGPUR.**

WRIT PETITION NO. 5486 OF 2025

s. Excelsource International Pvt Ltd Vadodara Vs. The State of Maharashtra and others)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr. D.S. Kanwale Advocate for petitioner.
Ms. Kalyani Marpakwar, AGP for respondent Nos. 1 to 4 /State.
Mr. M.I. Dhattrak, Advocate for respondent No. 5.

CORAM : ANIL S. KILOR & RAJNISH R. VYAS, JJ.

DATED : 14-11-2025.

Heard learned counsel for the parties, at length.

2. Affidavit in reply filed by respondent No. 5 is taken on record.

3. Challenge raised in the present petition is to rejection of technical bid of the petitioner for the work of 'Supply, Installation and Commissioning of Consumer Domestic Ultrasonic/Electromagnetic AMR Water Meter.

The reasons for rejection of the technical bid is mentioned in a Technical Evaluation Sheet. For the reasons given hereinbelow, as per the Technical Evaluation Sheet, bid has been rejected.

i) Learned counsel for the respondent pointed out that though the certificate in compliance with condition No. 5 is filed, the same is not of the work which was completed but it was relating to ongoing work whereas the experience of completed work was asked for.

ii) Learned counsel for respondent pointed out even the condition Nos. 6 and 7 are not fulfilled and for that purpose, he has referred to Recapitulation Sheet annexed along with petition at page 186. He has rightly pointed out that this is not a certificate which is required for

compliance of Condition No. 6 i.e. experience of successful supply, installation and commissioning of Ultrasonic/ Electromagnetic/Mechanical AMR Water Meter minimum 5,915 Nos of 15 mm dia or above in a Single Project in the last 5 years.

iii) Similar is the position as regards condition No. 7 wherein Household Service Connections required is 1517 in numbers whereas petitioner has completed 900.

Thus, the above referred three conditions appears to be not fulfilled by the petitioner and therefore, we do not find merit in the petition as no error is committed by respondent No. 5 in rejecting the technical bid of the petitioner. Accordingly, petition is dismissed.

(RAJNISH R. VYAS, J)

(ANIL S. KILOR, J)