



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CWP No.9158 of 2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision :01.04.2025**

M/s Bhim Chand and Company

.....Petitioner

Versus

**Haryana State Cooperative Supply and Marketing Federation Limited
and another**

..... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE ARUN PALLI
HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA**

Present : Mr. Anurag Chopra, Advocate and
Ms. Himani Jamwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ankur Mittal, Advocate,
Mr. Shivendra Swaroop, DAG, Haryana,
Ms. Kushaldeep Kaur, Advocate,
Mr. Shubham Chauhan, Advocate;
Mr. Siddhanth Arora, Advocate and
Ms. Sharvi Dadhwal, Advocate for the respondents.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral):

The Haryana State Cooperative Supply and Marketing Federation Limited had invited short term tender for loading/unloading and handling of food grains belonging to Food Corporation of India in godowns and cap storage.

In response thereto, the petitioner had submitted its bid. Which, however, has since been rejected by the Technical Evaluation Committee vide communication dated 27.03.2025. The limited grievance that the petitioner has is: no reasons are assigned by the authorities, as to how and on what grounds the petitioner is declared technically non-responsive. It is urged that prior to the institution of this petition, the petitioner had even represented to the respondents authorities vide a representation dated 27.03.2025 qua its concerns and grievances, but to no avail.

Served with the advance copy of the petition, Mr. Ankur Mittal, Advocate, is present in Court, for the respondents.



Upon being pointedly asked, he, as always, fairly submits that the price bids of the bidders have since been opened. And one of the tenderers has been declared L-I. Be that as it may, he submits, for the competent authority is already in seizin of the concerns/grievances of the petitioner, it would be expedient, if the petition is disposed of, to enable the respondents-authorities to deal therewith. He submits that the necessary orders on the representation (ibid), in accordance with law, shall be passed, within two weeks from today. And till then, the work order shall not be issued to the successful tenderer.

Learned counsel for the petitioner is agreeable to the course suggested by learned counsel for the respondents and submits that let this petition be disposed of in terms of the statement made by him.

The petition is, accordingly, disposed of in terms of the statements made by learned counsel for the parties.

This Court is sanguine that the respondents-authorities shall look into the matter in the right earnest. And, appropriate orders, shall be passed within the time indicated by the learned counsel for the respondents.

Needless to assert that this order shall not constitute any expression of opinion on the merits of the case of either party, for, as indicated above, the competent authority shall examine the claim/grievance of the petitioner, strictly in accordance with law.

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

01.04.2025

Manoj Bhutani

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No