



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 08.04.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE HEMANT CHANDANGOUDAR

W.P.(MD)No.8788 of 2026
and
W.M.P(MD)No.7113 of 2026

J.Shahul Hameed

.. Petitioner

- Vs. -

1. The District Collector,
Pudukkottai District,
Pudukkottai.
2. The Assistant Director of Panchayat,
O/o.Assistant Director of Panchayat,
Collectorate Complex,
Pudukkottai.
3. The Block Development Officer,
Panchayat Union Office,
Aranthangi.

.. Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of CERTIORARIFIED MANDAMUS calling for the records pertaining to the impugned technical bids of the petitioner in respect of 3rd Respondent E.Tender Notification vide his proceedings in Na.Ka.No. 331/2026/A3 dated 12.3.2026 and quash the same as illegal and to direct the 3rd Respondent to conduct E-Tender as per



Tamil Nadu Transparency in Tenders Act.

WEB COPY

For Petitioner : Mr.J.John

For Respondents : Mr.D.Sadiq Raja
Additional Government Pleader
for R1 & R2

: Mr.R.Ragavendran
Government Advocate(Crl. Side) for R3

ORDER

The petitioner challenges the rejection of technical bid of the petitioner by the third respondent. The third respondent issued a tender notification inviting bids for renovation of Panchayat office building namely, Subramaniyapuram, Mannakudi and Narpavalakudi Panchayat office buildings. The petitioner claiming to be eligible and qualified submitted a bid on 04.03.2026. The technical bid of the petitioner was opened on 06.03.2026 and it was found that the petitioner had not uploaded the latest GST certificate as mandated in the conditions of tender document. Therefore, since the essential documents have not been uploaded, technical bid of the petitioner was rejected.



WEB COPY

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner vehemently contended that the latest GST Certificate was uploaded along with the bid and the technical bid was opened in the absence of the petitioner which is in violation of Rule 21 of the Tamil Nadu Transparency in Tenders Rules, 2000, and therefore, the rejection of the bid of the petitioner is arbitrary and discriminatory.

3. Learned Government Advocate for the 3rd respondent has placed on record the bid submitted by the petitioner which reveals that the petitioner has not uploaded the latest GST certificate. The petitioner had uploaded the GST certificate for the month of December, 2025 and not uploaded the GST certificate for the month of January and February 2026. Therefore, the third respondent has rightly rejected the technical bids of the petitioner for not having uploaded the said document which is essential document and therefore, the rejection of the technical bid of the petitioner for not uploading the latest GST certificate cannot be said to be arbitrary and discriminatory. Learned Government Advocate for the 3rd respondent also submitted that pursuant to the tender notification, work orders had been issued to the successful bidders and no useful purpose will be served if the technical bids of the petitioner is accepted at this stage.



WEB COPY

4. Rule 21 of the Tamil Nadu Transparency in Tenders Rules, 2000, deals with the opening of the tenders and sub Rule 3 states that the tenders will be opened in the presence of the tenderers or one representative of the tenderer who chooses to be present.

5. Learned Government Advocate submitted that bids are submitted through online and upon verification of the technical bid, the technical bid will be accepted or rejected in the event of the bidder has not uploaded the essential documents. In any event, no prejudice is caused to the petitioner for not opening the technical bids in his presence since the petitioner had not uploaded the latest GST certificate.

6. The petitioner has also not produced the latest GST certificate that is for the month of January and February, 2026 along with the typeset of papers. The essential documents having not been uploaded, the rejection of the technical bid of the petitioner cannot said to be arbitrary or discriminatory or in violation of Rule 21 of the Tamil Nadu Transparency in Tenders Rules, 2000.



7. In view of the above, I do not find any illegality in the rejection of the technical bid of the petitioner. Accordingly, this Writ Petition is dismissed. No Costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

08.04.2026

Index : Yes/No
NCC : Yes/No

PJL

To

1. The District Collector,
Pudukkottai District,
Pudukkottai.
2. The Assistant Director of Panchayat,
O/o. Assistant Director of Panchayat,
Collectorate Complex,
Pudukkottai.
3. The Block Development Officer,
Panchayat Union Office,
Aranthangi.



WEB COPY



HEMANT CHANDANGOUDAR, J.

PJL

W.P.(MD)No.8788 of 2026

08.04.2026