



2025:AHC-LKO:60675-DB

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

WRIT - C No. - 9828 of 2025

Madras Security Printers Pvt. Ltd. Thru.
Authorized Signatory Mr. Benedict Philip

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

U.O.I. Thru. Secy. Ministry Of Railways New
Delhi And 6 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Gaurav Mehrotra
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	A.S.G.I.

Court No. - 2

**HON'BLE MRS. SANGEETA CHANDRA, J.
HON'BLE BRIJ RAJ SINGH, J.**

1. Heard Shri Gaurav Mehrotra, learned counsel for the petitioner and Ms. Akansha Dubey, learned counsel appearing for the respondents Union of India.

2. This petition has been filed by the petitioner with the following prayers :-

"(i). Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of certiorari quashing the decision dated 23.9.2025 as contained in Annexure No.1 to the writ petition communicated through email, whereby the petitioner's technical bid for Tender No.2025-AMV-CandW-E tender-45 has been rejected.

(ii). Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to accept and consider the petitioner's technical bid submitted through its duly authorised signatory, Mr. Benedict Philip.

(iii). Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to allow the petitioner to participate in the Reverse Auction process and other subsequent processes of the tender."

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the respondents have rejected the bid of the petitioner dated 23.9.2025 on a highly technical ground that the authorised signatory has not submitted the bid. It has been submitted that the authorised signatory is the Assistant Vice President and has a valid power of attorney and a Board resolution is also passed in his favour. However, the bid has been rejected by making such an observation that the bid was signed and submitted by a person who is not authorised to do so by the petitioner Company.

4. Learned counsel for the respondent has placed before this Court the papers relating to the bid documents submitted by the petitioner wherein the digital signatures of Arul Prathan Singh was appended. The certificate had been issued by Arul Prathan Singh to say that he is appointed as authorised signatory of the tenderer i.e. the petitioner.

5. It has been submitted that the petitioner itself says that the Assistant Vice President Mr. Benedict Philip is the authorised signatory and Arul Prathan Singh is not the authorised signatory.

6. We do not find any good ground to show any indulgence in the rejection of the technical bid of the petitioner. However, at this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner has stated that the alternative prayer for issuance of a direction to the respondent no.2 to refund the earnest money to the tune of Rs.47,50,500/- which has been deposited by the petitioner.

7. Ms. Akansha Dubey, learned counsel appearing for the respondent states that as the tender process is going on and as soon as the same is finalised, the petitioner may move a representation for refund of the earnest money, the same shall be released in favour of the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, this petition is **disposed of** with direction to the petitioner to move a representation as soon as the tender process is finalised and a direction is issued to the respondents to release the earnest money, within ten days from the date of receipt of the

September 26, 2025
Shukla

(Brij Raj Singh,J.) (Mrs. Sangeeta Chandra,J.)