



WEB COPY

WP No. 40499 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 21-11-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

**WP No. 40499 of 2025
and WMP.No. 45452 of 2025**

M/s Salem Prints,
Rep. by its Proprietor, Mr.Sankar,
No.388, Latif Complex, Hasthampatty,
Salem-636 007.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1.The Managing Director,
Tamilnadu State Transport Corporation, (Salem) Ltd,
No.12, Ramakrishna Road, Salem-636 007.

2.The Payper Ad. Media Private Ltd.,
No.254, Junction Main Road,
5 Roads Opposite Reliance Mall, Salem – 636 005.

3.M/s.Kashvi Retail,
No.104, A.J.Block 2nd Street,
Sriram Nagar, Anna Nagar, Chennai – 600 040.

Respondent(s)

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seeking issuance of writ of certiorarified mandamus, calling for the records relating to the impugned technical bid dated 25.07.2025 on the file of the 1st respondent, set aside the same consequently, directing the 1st respondent to issue a fresh tender document to display advertisements in their buses plying in Salem, Dharmapuri Regions.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.B.Manimaran

For Respondent(s): Mr.L.Jaivenkatesh for R2
Ms.Madhuri Donti Reddy for R1
R3 – Not ready in notice



ORDER

The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is an advertising company having MSME registration and also doing business more than six years. During the year 2021, the 1st respondent had floated a tender to display advertisements in their buses plying in Salem and Dharmapuri Region. As per the said tender, the period of license was for 33 months which has been divided into 3 spells each for 11 months. The 2nd and 3rd respondents were allowed to display advertisements for first two spells. However, unlawfully, the 1st respondents granted license in favour of the 2nd respondent to display advertisements for 3 spells by rejecting the petitioner's technical bid. Challenging the same, the present writ petition is filed.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that, admittedly, the petitioner had previous experience in the advertisement field even then, the petitioner's technical bid was rejected on the ground that the petitioner was not previously experienced in the advertisement field. Accordingly, he prayed for appropriate orders.

3. However, the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent would submit that the petitioner filed this writ petition stating there is no clause available seeking previous experience of three years, thereby, this Court granted interim stay in



favour of the petitioner. However, the petitioner has not demonstrated before this Court that he has previous experience in the advertisement field. As per the tender document Schedule – I, at least three years of experience is mandate in the advertisement field and the same should be annexed while applying tender. However, the petitioner did not annexe the evidence for previous experience thereby, his technical bid was disqualified. Hence, the impugned order need not be interfered with.

4. In view of the same, this Court is of the view that when the petitioner did not enclose his proof regarding experience in the advertisement field, rejection of the petitioner's technical bid by the respondent cannot be faulted. Accordingly, this Writ Petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

21-11-2025

kkn

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No



To

1.The Managing Director,
Tamilnadu State Transport Corporation, (Salem) Ltd,
No.12, Ramakrishna Road, Salem-636 007.

2.The Payper Ad.Media Private Ltd.,
No.254 Junction Main Road,
5 Roads Opposite Reliance Mall, Salem-636 005

3.M/s.Kashvi Retail
No.104, A.J.Block, 2nd Street, Sriram Nagar,
Anna Nagar, Chennai-600 040



WEB COPY

WP No. 40499 of 2



M.DHANDAPANI J.

KKN

WP No. 40499 of 2025

21-11-2025