

S/L 24
08.04.2026
Court. No. 25
sourav

WPA 8085 of 2026

**M/s. Sundaram Enterprises & Anr.
Vs.
The Union of India & Ors.**

*Ms. Pramiti Bandopadhyay
Mr. Rahul Kumar Singh
Ms. Utsa Poddar
Ms. Sneha Sarkar*

...for the petitioners.

Mr. Ashok Halder

...for the Union of India.

*Mr. Sanjib Kr. Mal
Ms. Shomrita Das
Mr. Shomrik Das*

...for the respondent nos. 2 and 3.

1. The affidavit-of-service and the supplementary affidavit filed in Court today are kept with the record.
2. The petitioners have filed the present writ application challenging the order of termination dated March 20, 2026 wherein the respondent authorities have terminated the TTs Nos. WB350853, WB350881 and WB350850 with immediate effect on the ground that the petitioners failed to transfer the ownership as well as the PESO licence of the vehicle within the stipulated period of four months from the date of issuance of the LOI.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the LOI was issued to the petitioners on April 12, 2025 and the petitioners have transferred the ownership as well as the PESO licence of the vehicle within four months from the date of issuance of the LOI. In spite of the same, the respondent authorities have terminated the contract of the petitioners.

4. Per contra, learned counsel appearing for the respondent authorities submits that before issuance of LOI, show-cause notice was issued to the petitioners on February 26, 2026. The petitioners have submitted the reply to the show-cause notice on March 6, 2026 but the petitioners have not disclosed in the show-cause reply that the petitioners have got the registration as well as the PESO licence transferred in the name of the petitioners and thus, the authorities have no other option but to terminate the contract of the petitioners on the ground of violation of terms and conditions of the LOI.
5. Heard the learned counsel for the respective parties. Perused the materials on record.
6. This Court finds that the authorities have issued the show-cause notice on the allegation that the petitioners have not transferred the ownership of the vehicle as well as the PESO licence within four months from the date of issuance of the LOI. But now the petitioners have disclosed the document which shows that the PESO licence and the registration of the vehicle have already been transferred in the name of the petitioners.
7. In view of the above, the impugned termination order dated March 20, 2026 is set aside and quashed. The petitioners are given liberty to file a supplementary reply to the show-cause notice within a week from date by disclosing the document to the authorities. If any reply is received by the authorities; the authorities shall consider the said reply along with the documents and pass reasoned and speaking order within a period of three weeks thereafter.

8. Learned counsel for the respondents raised objection with regard to the cause title and the affidavit portion and submits that in the cause title and in the affidavit portion the name of the petitioner no. 2 is recorded as 'Amina Mondal Das' but in the affidavit portion the deponent has signed as 'Anima Mondal Das'. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the actual name of the petitioner no. 2 is 'Anima Mondal Das' but inadvertently, the name has been typed as 'Amina Mondal Das'.
9. In view of the above, the petitioner is given liberty to correct the name of the petitioner no. 2 in the cause title and in the affidavit portion in course of the day as 'Anima Mondal Das' instead of 'Amina Mondal Das'.
10. **WPA 8085 of 2026** is disposed of.
11. Urgent photostat certified copies of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance with all the necessary formalities.

(Krishna Rao, J.)