



CWP-17511-2025

-1-

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

**CWP-17511-2025****Date of decision: 01.07.2025**

Lotus Defence and Aerospace Technologies Private Limited (formerly  
known as Lotus Machines Pvt Ltd) ....Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others ....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI**

Present: Mr. R. Kartikey, Advocate, and  
Ms. Ridhi Bansal, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Jyoti Chaudhary, Advocate, for respondent No.1.  
(Through Video Conferencing)

Mr. Sandeep Singh Ghangas, Advocate,  
for respondents No.2 to 4.

\*\*\*\*

**KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (Oral)**

1. The instant petition, as cast under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, has been filed for quashing of order dated 04.06.2025 (Annexure P-3), and a challenge is also thrown to the show cause notice of an even date (Annexure P-4), on the ground that the mandatory procedure prescribed under the Government E-Marketplace Incident Management Policy dated 25.11.2024 (hereinafter referred to as, 'the Policy') has not been adhered to.

2. During the course of hearing, what has surfaced, is that against the show cause notice (supra), the petitioner has already filed a reply, which is pending consideration before respondent No.4.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the impugned show cause notice has been issued to the petitioner without serving any



alert of any error. He further submits that it is the contractual obligation to serve the alert regarding any error, enabling the petitioner to rectify the same. However, since without adopting the procedure (supra), straightaway, a show cause notice was issued, therefore, the petitioner has all the apprehension that fate of the said notice would be against it.

4. I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. This Court do not find any substance in the apprehension expressed by him, requiring this Court to interfere and examine the legality of the impugned show cause notice, specifically when the petitioner has already filed a reply to the same, and the authorities are yet to adjudicate the matter. It is always open for the petitioner to raise the issue of non-compliance of the mandatory procedure, prior to the issuance of the show cause notice, as prescribed under the Policy, before the authorities concerned, and it is expected that the latter shall consider all aspects, before passing the final order.

6. In summa, the instant petition is disposed of, being a pre-mature motion. However, liberty is reserved to the petitioner to approach respondent No.4, who is seized of the matter, and raise all the pleas, which have been raised before this Court.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)  
JUDGE

01.07.2025  
Ak Sharma

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | Yes/No |