



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Dated:30.03.2026

WEB COPY

Coram

THE HON'BLE DR.JUSTICE G.JAYACHANDRAN
AND
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN

REV.APLC(MD).No.29 of 2026

Salma Begam (F-65/2025),
W/o.(Late) Abdul Kadar,
65 Pallivasal Street,
Koomapatti,
Virudhunagar District – 626 133. .. Review Petitioner/Appellant
/versus/

1. General Manager – LPG,
HPCL (South Zone),
Thalamuthu Natarajan Building,
8 Gandhi Irwin Road,
Chennai – 600 008.

2. Deputy General Manager (LPG – Distribution),
HPCL (South Zone),
Thalamuthu Natarajan Building,
8 Gandhi Irwin Road,
Chennai – 600 008. ..Respondents

Prayer: Review Petition under Section 114 read with Order 47 Rule 1 of C.P.C., pleased to graciously review the order dated 27.01.2026 in W.A. (M.D).No.65 of 2026 on the file of this Hon'ble Court, set aside the said order, allow the Review Petition.

For Petitioner :Mr.A.C.Namburaj



ORDER

WEB COPY

The Review Application is filed to review the order passed by this Court in W.A.(MD).No.65 of 2026, on the ground that the writ appellant is a women Entrepreneur running a MSME. The provisions of Section 6 of the MSME Act, 2012, ought to have been taken into consideration while considering the price quotation submitted by the appellant in the tender process.

2. The appellant, who participated in Tender No.2400019406-HD-09050-Bulk LPG Transportation, Tamil Nadu 2025-30 through the MSME Women Category. Since she indulged in an unsolicited revision of the price bid by invoking Clause 3.7 of the Tender Notification, her bid was not considered. Being aggrieved, she filed the Writ Petition seeking Mandamus to consider the petitioner's bid with the corrected price at the L1 rate (-5% on base rate).

3. The Learned Single Judge, after considering the grounds of the writ petition and the counter filed by the respondent, dismissed the writ petition, recording the fact that, at the time of submitting the tender, she had quoted 0% as the bid price and later sought for correction of the bid price stating that it was error crept while feeding the application through computer operator. The



said contention was not accepted by the Learned Single Judge and being aggrieved by the order passed by the Learned Single Judge, the appellant filed Writ Appeal (MD).No.65 of 2026.

4. We considered the plea of the appellant and the representation dated 09.09.2025 made to the respondent seeking to correct the bid amount which will match 1:1 Ratio and found that the unsolicited revision of the price bid was contrary to Clause 3.7 of the Tender Document. Accordingly, the appeal was dismissed, confirming the order passed by the Learned Single Judge. Hence, the present review petition is filed, citing the judgment of this Hon'ble Court in ***M/s.Reco Process Pumps v. BHEL & Ors.***, which allowed an MSE Woman entrepreneur to match the L1 price in a bulk supply contract invoking Section 6 of the MSME Act.

5. The Learned Counsel appearing for the review petitioner submitted that if the provisions of the MSME Act are not given effect to, the spirit of the Act would get defeated. It was further contended that Section 6 of the MSME Act will prevail over Clause 3.7 of the Tender Document.



6. We have given our anxious consideration to the above submissions.

The disqualification of the petitioner was in respect of the unsolicited revision of the price bid.

7. Hence, the Rev.Aplc.(MD).No.29 of 2026 stands dismissed and it has nothing to do with the privilege granted to women entrepreneurs engaged in MSMEs. No costs.

(Dr.G.J.J.) (K.K.R.KJ.)
30.03.2026

bsm

To,

1. General Manager – LPG,
HPCL (South Zone),
Thalamuthu Natarajan Building,
8 Gandhi Irwin Road,
Chennai – 600 008.

2. Deputy General Manager (LPG – Distribution),
HPCL (South Zone),
Thalamuthu Natarajan Building,
8 Gandhi Irwin Road,
Chennai – 600 008.



WEB COPY



**Dr. G.JAYACHANDRAN, J.
&
K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN, J.**

bsm

REV.APLC(MD).No.29 of 2026

30.03.2026