



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

CWP No.23235 of 2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 12.08.2025

ANKIT YADAV AND ANOTHER

.....Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL**  
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present: Mr. Alok Mittal, Advocate, for the petitioners.

\*\*\*\*

**ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (Oral)**

The petitioners have sought quashing of order dated 10.12.2024 (Annexure P-19), whereby their application for allotment of the Nursing Home Site No.8, Sector-38, Gurugram, has been declined.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners had applied for a Nursing Home Site in the auction held on 15.07.2022. He further submits that although their bid was highest but the same was not accepted by the respondents. He also submits that the petitioners being the successful bidder ought to have been allotted the site.

3. Issue notice to the respondents.

4. Mr. Ankur Mittal, Advocate and Ms. Ashna Singh, Advocate have put in appearance on behalf of respondent-HSVP on advance notice and submit that the bid of the petitioners was on the lower side. The respondent-HSVP had made a counter-offer to the petitioners on 22.08.2022 and gave them 48 hours to consider the same but the petitioners did not accept the said counter-offer. Therefore, the allotment could not be made to

them. The amount, which was deposited by the petitioners, had been refunded to them on 07.10.2022. They also submit that the petitioner had earlier preferred a petition bearing CWP-7465-2023, which was disposed of by this Court, vide order dated 12.03.2024 (Annexure P-13), with a direction to the respondents to consider the case of the petitioners and pass a speaking order. Pursuant to said order, speaking order dated 10.12.2024 (Annexure P-19) had been passed by the respondents. The petitioners once again had filed a petition bearing CWP-2313-2025, which was dismissed as withdrawn on 28.01.2025 (Annexure P-22) and this petition would not be maintainable qua the same prayer, which had been made in the previous petition.

5. Heard.

6. The petitioners are stated to have participated in the auction. They were the highest bidder, but their bid was not accepted and the respondents had made a counter-offer to the petitioners, which was not acceptable to the petitioners. The amount, which was deposited by the petitioners, had been refunded to them. The petitioners had preferred a petition wherein similar prayer had been made, which was dismissed as withdrawn on 28.01.2025. They have once again filed a petition on the same cause of action, which is wholly misconceived. Consequently, this petition being devoid of any merit stands dismissed.

**(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)**  
**JUDGE**

**12.08.2025**

*sandeep*

|                             |        |
|-----------------------------|--------|
| Whether Speaking/Reasoned : | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable :        | Yes/No |