



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

WRIT PETITION NO. 6551 OF 2025

Shubham s/o. Ravindra Munde
R/o. Shree Colony, Dastur Nagar
Rukhmini Nagar, Kamal Plaza,
Amravati-444606

....PETITIONER

....VERSUS....

1) State of Maharashtra,
Directorate of Marketing,
3rd Floor, New Central Building,
Ambedkar Wellesly Rd, Pune,
Maharashtra 411001

**2) Agriculture Product Market
Committee,**
Nandgaon Khandeshwar, District
Amravati
Through its Secretary/Chairman

3) Assistant Registrar,
Co-operative Societies, Nandgaon
Khandeshwar, District Amravati.

4) District Deputy Registrar,
Co-operative Societies, Amravati,
District Amravati.

5) Amit Janardhan Mohod,
Age Major, Occ: Secretary,
Off: Agriculture Product Market
Committee, Nandgaon Khandeshwar,
District Amravati.
Also R/o.: Asra, Taluka Bhatkuli,
District Amravati.

....RESPONDENTS

Amendment carried
out as per Court's
order dated 31.10.25

Shri U.V.Chakravarty, Advocate h/f. Shri A.V.Borkar, Advocate for petitioner.

Shri P.A.Kadu, Advocate for respondent nos. 2 and 5.

Shri S.M.Ukey, AGP for respondent nos. 3 and 4/State.

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

DATE : 12/11/2025

JUDGMENT (PER: RAJNISH R. VYAS, J.)

Heard finally by consent of learned counsel appearing for both the parties.

2. A short question which has arisen in this petition is, whether the petitioner can blame the respondent authorities for not supplying him the Geotagging Certificate, which was essential for participating in the tender process. Further, the question is, whether by obtaining the Geotagging Certificate, the petitioner would have received an opportunity to participate in the tender process. A tender was floated by the respondent authorities for *Sale of Land at Loni S. No. 342 of Agriculture Produce Market Committee, Nandgaon Khandeshwar, Dist. Amaravati.*

3. According to the petitioner, the officer of respondent no. 2 did not issue the Geotagging Certificate to the petitioner for participating in the tender process and therefore, for want of same, he could not participate in the tender process.

4. We have gone through the tender documents. According to the tender documents, one of the conditions was regarding submission of Geotagging Certificate. Admittedly, the said Geotagging Certificate was not supplied to the petitioner in spite of his request. Though the respondent authorities did not provide the Geotagging Certificate, which was necessary for participation in the tender process, the same will not result in putting an end to the controversy involved.

5. *Prima facie*, it may seem that the petition can be allowed on the same ground, but further developments would disentitle the petitioner from claiming any relief. Apart from the Geotagging Certificate, what was also

necessary was the submission of hard copies of the documents as per the tender documents.

6. Our attention has been invited by the learned counsel for the respondents to **Annexure-A1**, which is a comparative chart showing the details of information provided by all the bidders. So far as the petitioner is concerned, whose name appears in the chart, following remarks are made:-

"1) Site Visit Certificate by APMC, Nandgaon Khandeshwar = Attached but not signed by Competent authority.

2) Submission of Hard Copy = Not Submitted."

7. The aforesaid chart would clearly reveal that, the petitioner did not submit hard copy of the tender documents. The submission of the hard copy was required in view of Clause 17 (**Pg.36**) of the Tender Booklet, which reads thus;

"17 The contractor will have to sign the hard copy of the tender papers and the drawings according to which the work is to be carried out, the contractor shall also have to give a declaration to the effect that he has fully studied the plans, specifications, local conditions, and availability of labour and materials and that he has quoted his rates with the consideration to all these factors."

8. In view of non-submission of signed hard copy of the tender papers, no relief can be granted to the petitioner in view of Clause 19 of the tender condition which reads thus;

“19. The Tenderers, which do not fulfill all or any of the conditions or are incomplete in any respect are liable to summarily rejection.”

9. Further, no explanation has come from the petitioner as to why the said clause was not honoured. In view thereof, the petition deserves to be dismissed. Accordingly, the petition stands **dismissed**.

(RAJNISH R. VYAS, J.)

(ANIL S. KILOR, J.)