

2025:PHHC:080987-DB



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

CWP-18182-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 07.07.2025

ANITA

...Petitioner

Versus

HARYANA SHEHARI VIKAS PRADHIKARAN & ANR.

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA**

Present:- Mr. Abhinav Bali, Advocate for
Mr. Parshant Sethi, Advocate for the petitioner.

SUDHIR SINGH, J.

The petitioner has sought issuance of a writ in the nature of Certiorari quashing the impugned Clause 17 of the e-auction policy/brochure dated 20.07.2022 (Annexure P-2), terming the same to be illegal and ultravires the Constitution of India. A further writ of Certiorari has been sought quashing the action of the respondents in re-conducting e-auction of Plot No.476 (8 Marla) Sector 5, Hansi regarding which the e-auction had already been conducted on 23.11.2022.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has vehemently argued that the impugned Clause 17 of the policy/brochure, giving a right to the competent authority to cancel the bid and forfeit the whole amount of EMD deposited by the bidder,

is totally arbitrary and illegal as it gives unilateral power to the said authority. It is further argued that the bid of the petitioner has been cancelled without assigning any reason and despite having made numerous personal visits, the grievances of the petitioner had not been adverted to. It is further argued that the action of the respondent-authorities in re-conducting the e-auction, which had already been conducted on 23.11.2022 is also illegal and the petitioner being the highest bidder, her bid deserves acceptance.

3. We have heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

4. Admittedly, the policy/brochure governing the e-auction had been circulated by the respondent-authorities on 20.05.2021. The e-auction proceedings were initiated. The said policy was again circulated on 20.07.2022. The petitioner participated in the bid process on 23.11.2022 and according to the petitioner, she was the highest bidder. Thus, it is clear that before participating in the bid process, the aforesaid clause of the policy/brochure in respect of the e-auction was in the knowledge of the petitioner. The petitioner ought to have challenged the said policy before participating in the bid process. As per the settled law, once a person participates in the bid process after having known the terms of the policy or the terms and conditions of the brochure, he/she cannot allege the same to be arbitrary at a later stage. At the best, if according to the petitioner Clause 17 of the policy/brochure was arbitrary, she ought to have challenged the same before having participated in the bid process.

5. No other point has been urged.

6. In view of the above, we find that the petitioner does not deserve any indulgence in the present writ petition. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

7. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

[SUDHIR SINGH]
JUDGE

[DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA]
JUDGE

07.07.2025
himanshu

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