



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR
CIVIL APPLICATION (CAW) STAMP NO.26230 OF 2025

IN
WRIT PETITION NO.2982 OF 2025

[Rajendra Singh Kiledar Construction Pvt. Ltd. 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 order

Shri H.R. Gadhia, Counsel for Petitioner.

Shri D.V. Chauhan, Government Pleader for Respondent No.3.

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

DATE : 18th NOVEMBER, 2025.

1. This petition pertains to the rejection of technical bid of the petitioner in relation to the tender floated for construction of various road in Morshi City, District Amravati.
2. The petition was filed on 12th June, 2025 and on the same day, at the request of the learned counsel for the petitioner, it was heard and interim protection was granted by way of direction to the respondents to continue with the process of tender, but not to issue work order till next date.
3. Today, we have heard this matter at length and closed the matter for orders. It is pertinent to note that after 12th June, 2025, various affidavits and rejoinders were filed by the parties. Today, after a period of five months, during which the interim relief was operating, the petitioner seeks permission to amend the petition not in relation to the facts which will show that the petitioner's technical bid was illegally rejected, but he wants now to add the prayer clauses and raise the challenge to the qualification of L1, L2 and L3. According to us, the original scope of the petition was challenge to the rejection of the technical bid of the petitioner. The petitioner, in last five months when the interim relief was in operation in his favour, could have asked for expansion of the scope of the petition by way of adding the prayer clauses. However, after completing the

pleadings long back and after hearing the matter at length, we are of the opinion that the petitioner should not be allowed in the above-referred backdrop to expand the scope of the petition for the reason that the petitioner can file a substantive petition praying for reliefs prayed in the amendment application.

4. Accordingly, at this stage, the civil application is rejected.

(RAJNISH R. VYAS, J.)

(ANIL S. KILOR, J.)