WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

RESERVED ON : 24.11.2025
PRONOUNCED ON : 28.11.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE P.T.ASHA

W.P.(MD)No.33167 of 2025
and
W.M.P(MD)Nos.26182 & 26184 of 2025

Raudra Engineering Pvt.Ltd.,
(Formerly Known as Raudra Technocrats Private Limited),
Zion Z1, 1216-1218, Sindhu Bhavan Marg,
Bhodakdev, Ahmedabad,
Gujarat - 380054. .. Petitioner

Vs.

1.Ministry of Ports,
Shipping and Waterways,
Represented by its Secretary,
New Delhi.

2.Chief Engineer,
V.O.Chidambaranar Port Authority,
Administrative Office, Harbour Estate,
Tuticorin.

3.Superintending Engineer,
Civil Engineering Department
V.O.Chidambaranar Port Authority,
Administrative Office, Harbour Estate,
Tuticorin.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

4.Executive Engineer,
Civil Engineering Department,
V.O.Chidambaranar Port Authority,
Administrative Office, Harbour Estate,
Tuticorin.

5.M/s.Va Tech WABAG Ltd - Ramky Infrastructure Ltd
(Joint Venture),
WABAG House, No.17,
200 Feet Thoraipakkam - Pallavaram Main Road,
Sunnambu Kolathur, Chennai,
Tamil Nadu 600 117, India.

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for records of the 3rd respondent in order bearing Nil dated 17.11.2025 in respect of Notice Inviting Tender No.R-01CE/RCM and BMR/2025-26/D.886 dated 02.04.2025 issued by the 2nd Respondent herein and quash the same and consequently direct Respondents 2 to 4 to consider the petitioner's financial bid.

For Petitioner	: Mr.Srinath Sridevam Senior Counsel for Mr.P.M.N.Bhagavath Krishnan
For R1	: Mr.K.Maharajan Central Government Standing Counsel
For R2-R4	: Mr.N.Dilip Kumar

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

ORDER

The petitioner in the above writ petition seeks to quash the order of the 3rd respondent dated 17.12.2025 in respect of Notice Inviting Tender R-01CE/RCM and BMR/2025-26/D.886 issued by the 2nd respondent and consequently direct the respondents 2 to 4 to consider the petitioner's financial bid.

2. The facts of the case :

2.1 It is the case of the petitioner that on 02.04.2025, the 2nd respondent had issued a Notice Inviting Tender (NIT) calling for contractors to establish a 3 MLD desalination plant at Thoothukudi Port based on sea water reverse osmosis Post. As per the tender notification, the minimum qualification criteria (MQC) in respect of work experience stipulated that the tenderer should have successfully completed **similar work** as detailed therein during the last seven years up to 31.03.2025 with either of the following :

a) Three works, each costing not less than 40% of estimated cost i.e., Rs.26,97,63,888/-; or

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

b) two works, each costing not less than 50% of estimated cost i.e., Rs.33,72,04,860/- ; or

c) one work costing not less than 80% of estimated cost i.e., Rs.53,95,27,776/-.

2.2 The cost for the above works were exclusive of GST or Equivalent Tax. The tender further described similar work to mean “Design, construction, erection, installation, testing and commissioning of sea water desalination plant in State Government / Central Government / PSU's Sector with reverse osmosis process. It is the case of the petitioner that they had completed a similar project at Oman with a Joint Venture (JV) partner, namely Oman National Engineering and Investment Company “ONEIC”. The project at Oman was on a build, own and operate model with 10 years operation and maintenance period. Since the project was ongoing, the official completion certificate could be given only after the period of operation. The petitioner therefore submitted the project document demonstrating operation and maintenance experience which exceeded 5 years though the tender

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

requirement only prescribes only 5 years post completion of the project. It is the contention of the petitioner that the engineering, procurement and construction (EPC) work for the project had concluded in July 2020. To substantiate the same, the petitioner had submitted the latest water production records along with the corresponding payment details. That apart, the petitioner had also submitted a provisional completion certificate which clearly stipulated the start and end dates of the EPC work. The petitioner would submit that the project value was over Rs. 71.23 Crores which was far above the tender specification of Rs.53.95 Crores.

2.3 The petitioner would submit that in respect of work experience, except for the completion certificate, the petitioner had submitted the following documents to show that the documents to the project was a completed one.

a. The Original Contract and Award Letter issued by Sulthanate of Oman.

b. The Variation Order increasing the contract value.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

c. The invoices and payments made by Sulthanate of Oman along with daily and monthly water production details and flow of meter readings.

d. Annual Tax Certificates issued by the Oman Authorities.

e. Provisional Completion Certificate.

2.4 On 30.09.2025, the 2nd respondent had directed the petitioner to clarify certain points and also provide the shortfall documents. One of the clarifications that was sought for was the work completion certificate clearly mentioning the total value of work order and the related details. The next clarification was regarding the JV partner. The petitioner was given seven days to clarify and furnish the additional documents.

2.5 On 06.10.2025, the petitioner submitted a detailed reply to the above and they had clarified tht the desalination project was executed under a build, own and operate model with a 10 years operation and management period commencing from May 2018. Therefore, they had contend that completion certificate was not strictly applicable. They had

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

also clarified that the project undertaken by their JV partner at Oman was far more than the eligibility mentioned in the tender notice. Therefore, it is the contention of the petitioner that except for work completion certificate, all other documents had been provided. It is also their contention that the work completion certificate was never a MQC in the tender notice. The tender notice only required the petitioner to provide details of completed projects which the petitioner had also done.

2.6 The petitioner would submit that thereafter, they had not heard from the 2nd respondent. All of a sudden, on 24.10.2025, the petitioner received an email from the 2nd respondent and this email contained a link showing the status of the tender of the technical bid evaluation. On opening the same, the petitioner came to learn that their bid has been rejected on the ground that it did not fulfil the tender conditions with respect to MQC. No reasons were offered in the rejection order. It was also stated that the bid would be opened on 31.10.2025.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

2.7 Since the 2nd respondent had not provided the reasons, the petitioner had filed W.P.No.30935 of 2025before this Court. When the matter came up on 30.10.2025, the learned counsel for the 2nd and 3rd respondents submitted that since the petitioner submitted the documents on 28.10.2025, they would require some time to peruse the said documents. The writ petition was therefore disposed of on the basis of the above statement. Thereafter, by the impugned order dated 17.11.2025, once again the petitioner's technical bid had been rejected on the ground that the bid did not satisfy MQC. It is challenging this rejection order that the petitioner is before this Court. The petitioner would submit that once again no reasons have been given for rejecting the bid, particularly when the necessary clarifications and documents had been submitted by them. Therefore, this writ petition. The respondents 2 to 4 have made oral submissions and filed written submissions. No counter was filed on their behalf.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

3. Submission:

3.1 The learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has made his oral submissions and written submissions has also been produced. He would submit that the respondents 2 to 4 have acted in an unfair manner and consequently, erred in the decision making process. Further, they have come up with different reasons at different stages to disqualify the petitioner from the bid process.

3.2 The petitioner's contention is that they satisfied the MQC as their Joint Venture (JV) Partner, ONEIC had completed a similar work for the Sultanate of Oman and that the work is still on going. However, respondents 2 to 4 have failed to consider the same. The contention of the respondents 2 to 4 is that the project undertaken by the petitioner's JV partner is on a Build, Operate and Own basis and does not include within its terms design or sea water desalination is a fallacy. The petitioner's argument is that they fulfilled the MQC with reference to design and sea water intake. To support this argument, the petitioner has produced the Variation Order No.1. In Section A to the Variation Order No.1 the scope

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

of work included design. The design related to set up of sea water intake structure to feed water to the desalination plant, pipeline for transmitting water from sea to desalination plant, and vice versa and power station. That apart, in the original contract in Section 3 relating to scope of services, Clause 3 deals with the salient features of the plant where it provides that the contractor would be allowed to abstract brackish or sea water from the nearby existing bore wells owned by the Public Authority for Electricity and Water (PAEW). The contract further provides that it is the responsibility of the contractor to provide any additional wells or other water intakes including direct sea intake.

3.3 The petitioner would further contend that the conditions of this tender document entered into between their JV partner and the Sultanate of Oman represented by PAEW, particularly Condition 4.1.5 would clearly prove that design was contemplated under the said contract. Further as per Clause 3.4.6 of the scope of works, the contractor was required to provide sufficient water quality tests from the proposed raw water before designing the plant. Therefore, it is the contention of the

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

petitioner that they fully qualify the MQC relating to design.

3.4 As regards the 2nd criteria of providing the work completion certificate, it is the argument of the petitioner that since the work of their JV partner PAEW is still ongoing, the furnishing of the work completion certificate may not be possible. However, they have provided a certificate of completion of EPC (Engineering, Procurement and Construction) stage, dated 27.10.2025 for the Oman Water and Wastewater Serices Company (Nama Water Services). Therefore, it is the contention of the petitioner that the rejection of the technical bid on the ground that the petitioner does not satisfy the MQC is without any basis.

3.5 The petitioner would also contend that the respondents have at each stage provided new reasons for rejection. Consequently, there is an illegality in the decision making process, irrationality and procedural impropriety. Therefore, the impugned proceedings have to be quashed. In support of this argument, they would rely upon the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in ***1994 (6) SCC 651 (TATA Cellular***

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Vs. Union of India).

3.6 These arguments are sought to be repelled by Mr.N.Dilip Kumar, learned Senior Counsel appearing for respondents 2 to 4 by contending that the establishment of the desalination plant at the V.O.C Port Authority is a project of great national importance being developed on a Design, Build, Finance, Operate and Transfer basis coming under the direct control of the Prime Minister's office. This project arises to meet potable water needs and to enhance water security of the country. He would contend that under notice dated 07.02.2025, tenders were invited for the above project for an estimated cost of Rs.67,44,09,720/-.. The date of opening of the tender was scheduled on 24.04.2025. Thereafter, the last date for submission was extended to 21.08.2025 and opening of bids was scheduled on 22.08.2025. The technical bid was opened on 23.08.2025. The bids were received from two persons, namely M/s.Va Tech WABAG Lts-RAMKY INFRASTRUCTURE LTS-JV and M/s.Raudra Technocrats Private Ltd-OMAN National Engineering and Investment Company – JV. The respondents 2 to 4 had engaged the

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

services of Tamil Nadu Water Investment Company (TWIC) as the Project Management Consultant. The Tender Committee meeting was held on 26.09.2025 wherein the technical evaluation report of TWIC was deliberated. The Project Management Consultant had opined that M/s.Va Tech WABAG Lts-RAMKY INFRASTRUCTURE LTS-JV had fulfilled the required conditions of the tender and had noted series of shortfall and deviations in the documents submitted by the petitioner. However, the Tender Evaluation Committee by their minutes, dated 26.09.2025 decided to obtain clarifications and supporting documents from the petitioner. Accordingly, a communication dated 30.09.2025 was issued to the petitioner seeking clarification / shortfall documents which were required to be submitted within seven days. The clarifications that were sought for for are as follows :

> *"Work completion certificate clearly mentioning the total value of work completion, work order, and the details related (Design details of sewage treatment plant, to the work "Design, build, own and Operate Water Desalination Plants in Musandam Governate that includes major plants at Khasab, Dibba and Bukha in the capacity of 10,000 cum/day" and proof of official tax deduction / withholding*

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

tax certificates or payment proofs issued by the Sultanate of Oman to M/s ONEC for the above mentioned work."

3.7 Therefore, the two clarifications / documents that was sought for from the petitioner was :-

(a) The design of the plant alleged to have set up by the petitioner for desalination of sea water

(b) The value of the completed work in order to prove that is is compliant with the MQC for executing one work

(c) The emphasis on design was on account of the fact that the work included design in addition to construction, erection, installation, testing and commissioning.

3.8 The petitioner had submitted a reply dated 06.10.2025 enclosing the additional documents. However, the documents were not relevant for the queries raised by the respondents 2 to 4. The petitioner had only submitted a payment invoice issued by PAEW of the Sulthanate of Oman and this payment invoice was for the year 2025. The same was therefore not relevant to the EPC period. That apart, the tax documents

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

related to the year 2023 and 2024. No documents were submitted relating to the period of building and construction of the plant. Therefore, the petitioner's bid was rejected on the ground of its non-fulfilling the MQC by proceedings of the 2nd respondent dated 24.10.2025.

3.9 This rejection order was challenged by the petitioner by filing W.P(MD)No.30935 of 2025. Since fresh documents were submitted by the petitioner on 28.10.2025, this Court by order dated 30.10.2025 had disposed of the writ petition quashing the order and directing that a fresh decision be taken after scrutinizing additional documents submitted on 28.10.2025.

3.10 The documents which had been submitted on 28.10.2025 which were placed before the Tender Committee was forwarded to TWIC for technical consideration. The petitioner had submitted one fresh document, namely certificate of completion of EPC issued by the Chief Operation Officer of the Oman Water Services and Wastewater Services Company. The EPC stage was shown to have been completed on

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

15.07.2020 and the estimated value was OMR 57,00,000. It is his contention that if the petitioner had completed the EPC stage, he would have submitted the audited value of the work rather that the estimated value of the work. That apart, since Clause (b) of the note to MQC mandates the submission of TDS certificate (Form 16A) issued by the department where the work was executed. The petitioner had however submitted tax invoices only for the months of May and June which is pertaining to the period of operation and maintenance and not EPC. Once again, the petitioner had failed to produce the design details despite specific request for the same. TWIC on considering the documents had recommended that there was no clarity in the scope of works for construction of SWRO plants as mentioned in MQC "Similar Works" in the documents submitted and further, the petitioner had not furnished their requirements sought for namely the details relating to design and works for confirming the sea water RO based desalination works.

3.11 In the light of these comments and evaluation of the documents submitted by TWIC, the Tender Committee by its resolution

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

dated 14.11.2025 recommended that the petitioner did not qualify MQC and should be disqualified. Therefore, the impugned order disqualifying the petitioner came to be uploaded on 17.11.2025. The learned counsel would submit that the petitioner cannot after failing to submit the requisite documents state that they have complied with the requirements of MQC. That apart, the eligibility based on technical requirements cannot be the subject matter of writ pettiion as held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in its judgment reported in ***2022 (6) SCC 127 (N.G.Projects Limited Vs. Vinod Kumar Jain & Others)***. The petitioner's documents had been submitted to an expert for appraisal and they on appraisal, had found the same to be unsatisfactory. Therefore, no exception can be taken to proceedings, dated 17.11.2025 and consequently, he prayed that the writ petition be dismissed.

4. Discussion:

4.1 The petitioner is before this Court challenging the proceedings dated 17.11.2025 of the 3rd respondent in and by which the technical bid submitted by the petitioner has been rejected. The challenge primarily is

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

on the following grounds :

a) The order is non-speaking one inasmuch as no reasons have been given except to state that the petitioner does not fulfill the MQC stipulated in the eligibility requirement of the bidder.

(b) The respondents 2 to 4 have been shifting their stand at every stage with regard to the reasons for rejecting the petitioner's bid.

(c) That the respondents 2 to 4 have not holistically considered the documents submitted by the petitioner which would clearly show that they satisfy the MQC.

4.2 The admitted facts of the case is that the tender which has been floated by the respondents 2 to 4 is for the establishment of a 3MLD desalination plant based on sea water reverse osmosis at the V.O.Chidambaranar Port and Operation and Maintenance for 5 years on DOB mode. It is also not in dispute that the MQC prescribed was :-

a) Work experience : Tenderer had to satisfy that they have successfully completed "similar work" during the last seven years.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Similar work has been described in the tender as “Design, construction, erection, installation, testing and commissioning of sea water desalination plant with reverse osmosis process in State Government / Central Government / PSU'sSector. This similar work was once again detailed in the NIT at Clause 3 (a).

b) Submission of the work completion certificate furnished by any Government Department supported with TDS certificate issued by the department where the work was executed for full executed amount of work. It was further stated that unless the work completion certificate is enclosed, the work experience will not be considered. In order to state that the petitioner had requisite MQC with reference to design, the petitioner would press into service the Variation Order No.1 issued to their JV partner by the PAEW representing the Sulthanate of Oman. A perusal of this variation order would indicate that the Public Authority for Water referred to as DIAM was desirous of enhancing the scope of service for the project PAEW/HO/GDO/59/2017 relating to the project build, own and operate water desalination plants in Musandam Governate. The original agreement was entered into on 17.11.2018

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

between the petitioner's JV partner and Sulthanate of Oman represetned by PAEW. Clause 2 of the Variation Order, dated 17.11.2018 would stipulate as follows :

> *"2. This Variation Order No.(1) to the Original Agreement shall be to increase the Scope of Services so as to provide and carry out the Services for the aforementioned Contract of* ***Build, Own and Operate Water Desalination Plants in Musandam Governate*** *and to increase the Contract sum for the increased Scope of Services to be provided as given in Schedule "A" to this Variation Order No.(1) to the Original Agreement. This Variation Order No.(1) to the Original Agreement together with the Original Agreement shall, therefore constitute the First Variation Order between the DIAM and the Contractor."*

4.3 Clause 1.0 deals with the increased scope of service and clause 1.0 (ii) would read that in order to meet the increasing demand of water at Khasab, DIAM has decided to include Khasab Wilayat under this build, own and operate contract. Serial No.1 therein contemplates the scope of work, which is the setting up Khasab plant by relocating DIAM desalination plant from AI Ghubrah to Khasab (20 units with accessories) with a capacity of 10,000 cum/day. The petitioner's contention is that

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

since design is referred to in this increased scope of services, they would be compliant with the MQC prescribed by respondents 2 to 4. Therefore, it would be useful to understand the nature of the design contemplated in this increased scope of services. Design is used in the scope of services for four works.

a) setting up sea water intake structure to feed water to the desalination plant including supply of pumps and pipes

b) building pipeline for transmitting water from sea to desalination plant

c) building water pipeline from the desalination plant to the sea and drill drainage well

d) supply of power station with the cost of installation of equipments.

4.4 From a reading of the aforesaid clauses, it is clearly evident that the increased scope of work related to the relocation of an already installed desalination plant from AI Ghubrah to Khasab and the design is with reference to certain parts required for the desalination plant and not

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

the design of desalination plant by itself. This Court is constrained to go into the nitty-gritty of this contract since the argument is sought to be made that the petitioner is compliant with the requirements of design as prescribed in the MQC. In the tender on hand, the MQC relating to design is with reference to the desalination plant by itself. Therefore, the recommendation of the Project Management Consultant (TWIC) which is the expert body cannot be brushed aside. The entire project appears to be a first of its kind in the country for providing potable water and enhancing water security by utilising sea water desalination technology.

4.5 The MQC as stipulated in the tender contract clearly prescribes two ingredients to constitute the MQC.

a) The work experience that the tenderer has successfully completed similar work during the last seven years and Similar Work has been further expanded and described in the tender to mean design, construction, erection, installation, testing and commissioning of sea water desalination plant with reverse osmosis process. The project that had been undertaken by the petitioner's JV partner was on a build, own

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

and operate basis and design has not been contemplated therein. The next criteria which was required to be complied with is the submission of work completion certificate by the department where the work was executed in full along with TDS certificates. The additional document that has been submitted on 28.10.2021 has not been considered by TWIC since the certificate of completion of the engineering, procurement and construction stage would indicate that the project was completed on 15.07.2020. However, the tax invoice that has been submitted relates to the period May and June 2025 much beyond the completion of EPC stage. Therefore, the petitioner has not fulfilled both these criteria. Therefore, having not qualified for the MQC, the petitioner cannot demand that they be considered for the financial bid. Another fact which is to be taken note of is the fact that the petitioner in the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition and written submissions has contended that the work at Oman was executed by themselves and their JV partner. This appears incorrect inasmuch as the contract had been entered into only between the Sulthanate of Oman and the petitioner's JV partner. In the judgment relied upon by the petitioner, namely ***1994 (6) SCC 651 (TATA***

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Cellular Vs. Union of India), the duty of the Court in determining whether the decision on which an administrative action can be subject to judicial review can be classified as follows :

> "*(i) Illegality : This means the decision-maker must understand correctly the law that regulates his decision-making power and must give effect to it.*
>
> *(ii) Irrationality, namely, Wednesbury unreasonableness.*
>
> *(iii) Procedurel impropriety."*

4.6 If the present case is examined within these parameters, it is clear that the respondents 2 to4 have taken steps to give sufficient opportunity to the petitioner to provide the clarification and documents to show that they satisfy MQC. It is stated that the other bidder had qualified in the very first round itself. However, the petitioner was given not one opportunity, but two to submit additional documents originally by an order dated 30.09.2025 and thereafter, by orders of this Court, dated 30.10.2025. Despite there being given sufficient time, the petitioner has not been in a position to provide the documents that they satisfy MQC. The petitioner has accused the respondents of taking different stances at different stages. This argument cannot be

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

countenanced for the simple reason that the tender documents clearly stipulated the criteria and documents that were required to satisfy the MQC. Having perused the said documents, the petitioner has submitted the bid which is found to be wanting. Thereafter, in the communication dated 30.09.2025, the respondents had in very clear terms called upon the petitioner to provide work completion certificate and the details related to the design details of the sewage plant, treatment plant. From the documents provided before this Court, it is seen that these are the two requirements that has been consistently called for by the respondents 2 to 4 and the allegations to the contrary has to necessarily be turned down.

4.7 A perusal of the minutes of the meeting would also show the manner in which the Tender Committee has taken pains to provide sufficient opportunity to the petitioner despite which the petitioner has not been able to satisfy MQC. In the judgment in ***2022 (6) SCC 127 (N.G.Projects Limited Vs. Vinod Kumar Jain & Others)***, the Hon'ble Supreme Court had after extracting the march of law relating to the scope of interference of Courts in tender matters, summarised the position of

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

law in Paragraph No.17 as follows :

> *"17. Therefore, the position of law with regard to the interpretation of terms of the contract is that the question as to whether a term of the contract is essential or not is to be viewed from the perspective of the employer and by the employer. Applying the aforesaid position of law to the present case, it has been the contention of respondent No. 1 that the format for bank guarantee was not followed strictly by the State and that the relaxation given was not uniform, in that respondent No. 1 was singled out. The said contention has found favour with the Courts below."*

4.8 The Hon'ble Supreme Court had further observed that whether the bidder satisfying the tender conditions is primarily upon the authority inviting bids and it is not for the Courts to interfere with the well considered decision taken by them, they have observed as follows :

> *"22. The satisfaction whether a bidder satisfies the tender condition is primarily upon the authority inviting the bids. Such authority is aware of expectations from the tenderers while evaluating the consequences of non-performance. In the tender in question, there were 15 bidders. Bids of 13 tenderers were found to be unresponsive i.e., not*

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

satisfying the tender conditions. The writ petitioner was one of them. It is not the case of the writ petitioner that action of the Technical Evaluation Committee was actuated by extraneous considerations or was mala fide. Therefore, on the same set of facts, different conclusions can be arrived at in a bona fide manner by the Technical Evaluation Committee. Since the view of the Technical Evaluation Committee was not to the liking of the writ petitioner, such decision does not warrant for interference in a grant of contract to a successful bidder.

23. In view of the above judgments of this Court, the Writ Court should refrain itself from imposing its decision over the decision of the employer as to whether or not to accept the bid of a tenderer. The Court does not have the expertise to examine the terms and conditions of the present day economic activities of the State and this limitation should be kept in view. Courts should be even more reluctant in interfering with contracts involving technical issues as there is a requirement of the necessary expertise to adjudicate upon such issues. The approach of the Court should be not to find fault with magnifying glass in its hands, rather the Court should examine as to whether the decision-making process is after complying with the procedure contemplated by the tender conditions. If the Court finds that there is total arbitrariness or that the

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

tender has been granted in a mala fide manner, still the Court should refrain from interfering in the grant of tender but instead relegate the parties to seek damages for the wrongful exclusion rather than to injunct the execution of the contract. The injunction or interference in the tender leads to additional costs on the State and is also against public interest. Therefore, the State and its citizens suffer twice, firstly by paying escalation costs and secondly, by being deprived of the infrastructure for which the present day Governments are expected to work."

4.9 The learned Judges had concluded by sounding a word of caution as follows :

"*26. A word of caution ought to be mentioned herein that any contract of public service should not be interfered with lightly and in any case, there should not be any interim order derailing the entire process of the services meant for larger public good. The grant of interim injunction by the learned Single Bench of the High Court has helped no one except a contractor who lost a contract bid and has only caused loss to the State with no corresponding gain to anyone."*

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

5. In the light of the above, it is clear that there is no anamolly in the impugned order and consequently, this Writ Petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

28.11.2025

NCC : Yes/No
Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes
gbg

To
1.Ministry of Ports,
Shipping and Waterways,
Represented by its Secretary,
New Delhi.

2.Chief Engineer,
V.O.Chidambaranar Port Authority,
Administrative Office, Harbour Estate,
Tuticorin.

3.Superintending Engineer,
Civil Engineering Department
V.O.Chidambaranar Port Authority,
Administrative Office, Harbour Estate,
Tuticorin.

4.Executive Engineer,
Civil Engineering Department,
V.O.Chidambaranar Port Authority,
Administrative Office, Harbour Estate,
Tuticorin.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

P.T.ASHA, J.

gbg

W.P.(MD) No.33167 of 2025

28.11.2025

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis