



\$~35

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 7121/2025 & CM APPL. 32156/2025**

FINOLEX J POWER SYSTEMS LTD

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr.Ashish Mohan, Sr. Adv. with
Mr.Harsh Ahuja, Mr.Anshul
Chowdhary, Mr.Abhishek Arora,
Mr.Nakul Dahiya and Mr.Ajay
Choudhary, Advs.

versus

DELHI TRANSCO LIMITED

.....Respondent

Through: Ms.Anubha Dhulia, Adv. with
Mr.Vinayak Menon, Adv. along with
Mr.Arshad Ali, Manager (Legal),
DTL, Mr.Avadhesh Dwivedi, AM
(Legal), DTL, Mr.Vivek Kumar
Sharma, Manager (T) and Mr.Shivraj
Prajapat, DM (T).

CORAM:

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TUSHAR RAO GEDELA

ORDER

%

23.05.2025

CM APPL. 32157/2025 (for exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 7121/2025 & CM APPL. 32156/2025 (for stay)

3. Heard the learned counsel for the parties.



4. It has been stated by learned senior counsel representing the petitioner that in respect of the grievances relating to decision of the tendering authority declaring its bid to be non-responsive technically, a representation was made to the Managing Director of the respondent. He has also stated that except for indicating on the portal that the bid has not been found to be responsive technically, no reasons have been assigned.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel representing the respondent has stated, on instructions, that even the representation made by the petitioner was considered by the Chairman-cum-Managing Director, which has been rejected, though the said decision has not been communicated to the petitioner. She has, however, stated that the petitioner is aware of that decision.

6. Be that as it may, since the reasons for arriving at the decision by the Chairman-cum-Managing Director rejecting the representation were never supplied to the petitioner, we inquired from learned counsel for the respondent as to whether said reasons can be supplied to the petitioner/

7. Ms. Anubha Dhulia, learned counsel representing the respondent has, on instructions, stated that the reasons for decision of Chairman-cum-Managing Director rejecting the representation made by the petitioner shall be supplied to him before any final Letter of Award is issued.

8. Accordingly, we dispose of this writ petition along with the pending application in terms of the statement made by learned counsel for the respondent.

9. We make it clear that we have not adjudicated any issue raised in the writ petition on merits. We further provide that in case the petitioner is still aggrieved by the reasons to be supplied under this order, it will have an



opportunity to challenge the same by way of taking appropriate legal proceedings/remedies which may be permissible under law.

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ

TUSHAR RAO GEDELA, J

MAY 23, 2025
"shailndra"