



\$~232 & 234

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
(232)

+ W.P.(C) 19424/2025, CM APPL. 80960/2025 & CM APPL. 80961/2025

M/S KHAIRA TOURIST SERVICEPetitioner
Through: Mr. Ayush Gupta and Ms. Perna
Chaturvedi, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.Respondents
Through: Mr. Shashank Dixit, CGSC with Mr.
Kunal Raj, Advocates.
Mr. Sarvesh P. Shrivastava, GP for
UOI.

(234)

+ W.P.(C) 19453/2025, CM APPL. 81135/2025 & CM APPL. 81136/2025

MS IP TRAVEL LINES AND ANOTHERPetitioners
Through: Dr. Ankit Gupta, Ms. Minakshi Goyal
and Mr. Mukul Rana, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERSRespondents
Through: Ms. Nidhi Raman, CGSC with Mr.
Arnav Mittal, GP and Mr. Akash
Mishra, Advocate for R-1/UOI.
Mr. Gurpreet Singh Sachdeva,
Advocates for R-3 and 4.

CORAM:
HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TUSHAR RAO GEDELA

%

ORDER
22.12.2025



1. Present writ petitions have been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, 1950, seeking a direction to the respondents to award the tenders dated 07.08.2025 and 05.08.2025 in favour of the successful bidders, i.e. the petitioners herein, and further seek a direction restraining the respondents from awarding or allotting the tenders to any bidder other than the petitioners.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners invites the attention of this Court to the disqualification of the petitioners for the tender dated 07.08.2025 on the grounds that in W.P.(C) 19424/2025, the petitioners were remarked as *“Disqualified (i) – Statutory Non-compliant: The financial bid is disqualified on grounds of Statutory Non-compliant”* and W.P.(C) 19453/2025, as – *“Disqualified (i) Abnormally Low Rate: The Financial bid is disqualified on grounds of Abnormally Low Rate”*.

3. The primary grievance of the petitioners is the non-supply of reasons for disqualification.

4. We have heard the learned counsel for the petitioners.

5. It is settled law that administrative action should be predicated on reasons. Though the orders which may be passed may not be akin to judicial pronouncements, yet, reasons ordinarily form the bedrock of any action taken by the administrative authorities.

6. Keeping in view the fact that the rejection/disqualification does not disclose the reasons for rejection, we deem it appropriate to direct that these writ petitions may be treated as representations and shall be disposed of by the competent authority of the respondents by way of a speaking order within 10 days from today. Any such speaking order/decision shall be furnished forthwith to the petitioners. The petitioners, if so, aggrieved by the decision rendered by the authority, would be at liberty to approach this Court in accordance with law.



7. In view of the aforesaid, the present petitions alongwith the pending applications stand disposed of.

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ

TUSHAR RAO GEDELA, J

DECEMBER 22, 2025

rl