



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

WRIT PETITION NO. 8249 OF 2025

Kundan Gold Mines Pvt. Ltd. Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.

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

Court's or Judge's orders.

Mr. J.T. Gilda, Senior Advocate a/b. Mr. A.J. Gilda, Advocate for the
Petitioner.

Ms. Deepali Sapkal, AGP for Respondent No.1/State.

Mr. Sarabjeet Singh, Advocate for Respondent No.2.

Mr. Shyam Dewani, Advocate for Respondent No.3.

CORAM : RAJ D. WAKODE, J.

DATE : 30th DECEMBER, 2025.

Heard Mr. J.T. Gilda, learned Senior Counsel
instructed by Mr. A.J. Gilda, learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. On 22nd December, 2025, this Court had issued notice, making it returnable on 30th December, 2025. The notice issued by this Court has been duly served upon the respondents. On 22nd December, 2025, the learned AGP had waived service of notice on behalf of respondent No.1. Today, Mr. Sarabjeet Singh, learned counsel, appears on behalf of respondent No.2, and Mr. Shyam Dewani, learned counsel, appears on behalf of respondent No.3. Both the learned counsel appearing for respondent Nos.2 and 3 submit that they have been recently served with the notice and, therefore, seek time to file reply in the matter. Ms. Deepali Sapkal, learned AGP, appearing for respondent No.1/State, submits that the reply has been drafted and sent for approval; however, since the approval has not yet been received, the reply could not be filed.

3. In view of the above, list the matter for further consideration on 7th January, 2026.

4. Mr. Gilda, learned Senior Counsel, has invited my attention to paragraph 7 of the order dated 22nd December, 2025, wherein it was made clear that if the reply is not filed by the next date, the Court may take a call to grant interim relief. However, in view of the fact that the respondent Nos.2 and 3 are recently served and are ready to file reply on merits on or before 7th January, 2026, and that the matter will be heard finally on the said date, the interim relief as prayed for by the petitioner in the petition cannot be considered at this stage.

5. However, the fact remains that respondent No.3 was declared as the preferred bidder by respondent No.1 on 12th December, 2025. The petitioner has approached this Court challenging the said notice dated 12th December, 2025 by filing the present writ petition. On 22nd December, 2025, this Court had issued notice to the respondents; however, no interim order restraining respondent No.1 from issuing Letter of Intent to respondent No.3 was passed.

6. In view of the above, and since respondent No.1 has not issued any Letter of Intent since 12th December, 2025, it is expected that respondent No.1 shall further refrain from issuing any such Letter of Intent to respondent No.3 till 7th January, 2026.

7. Mr. Dewani, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.3, submits that he does not have instructions as to whether any Letter of Intent has been issued by respondent

No.1. Learned AGP is also not in a position to make a statement in that regard. In these circumstances, the aforesaid interim order shall be subject to the contingency that the Letter of Intent has not been issued as of today.

(RAJ. D. WAKODE, J.)

Vijaykumar