



CWP-10265-2026 (O & M)

-1-

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

115

CWP-10265-2026 (O & M)
Date of Decision:10.04.2026

RAHUL BHALLA

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR**

Present: Mr. S.S. Gill, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. A.S. Khara, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Sanjeev Soni, Advocate and
Mr. Tara Dutt, Advocate
for respondents No.3 and 4.

SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (ORAL)

CM-5613-CWP-2026

1. Application is allowed as prayed for.
2. New auction advertisements as well as fresh terms and conditions for auction are taken on record as Annexures P-5 and P-6.

Main Case

1. This writ petition has been filed, *inter alia*, for issuance of a writ of certiorari for quashing resolution dated 13.02.2026, Annexure P-4, passed by Improvement Trust, Amritsar, respondents No.3 and 4.

**CWP-10265-2026 (O & M)****-2-**

2. Counsel for the petitioner states that respondents No.3 and 4 published a schedule for auction of some properties and petitioner participated in the bid process. He states that petitioner was the highest bidder for SCO bearing No.62 (Corner) under the 97 Acres Scheme, with a bid of Rs.5,04,50,625/-, but in a meeting held on 13.02.2026, impugned resolution was passed cancelling some of auction processes, including the one in which the petitioner had participated. Counsel contends that respondents have acted in an arbitrary manner and despite being the highest bidder, he is being deprived of the property.

3. Advance copy of the petition has been served upon the respondents.

4. On asking of the Court, Mr. A.S. Khara, Sr. DAG, Punjab, has put in appearance on behalf of respondents No.1 and 2.

5. Mr. Sanjeev Soni, Advocate and Mr. Tara Dutt, Advocate have put in appearance on behalf of respondents No.3 and 4. He has supported the impugned action by submitting that a group of persons, who were probably connected with each other, had participated in the bid, which was nothing, but a friendly match. Counsel emphasizes that bids for some of the auctioned properties were received from the same IP address, which raised suspicion. He states that earnest money deposited by the petitioner has already been refunded. He has placed reliance upon judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Indore Vikas Praadhikaran (IDA) and another Vs. Shri Humud Jain Samaj Trust and another 2024 SCC Online SC 3511.**

**CWP-10265-2026 (O & M)****-3-**

6. Having heard counsel for the parties and after considering their submissions, this Court is of the view that there is no merit in the writ petition. In ***Indore Vikas Praadhikaran's case (supra)***, Supreme Court has observed that merely by offering highest bid, a participant does not acquire any vested right for execution of a contract in his favour. Government has freedom of contract and power of judicial review of administrative decisions is limited. The right to accept or reject a bid, is always available with the Government. There can be no concluded contract in the absence of acceptance of a bid and issuance of allotment letter. Petitioner cannot assert that his bid be accepted. This Court does not find any ground to interfere in the impugned decision taken by respondents No.3 and 4.

7. There is no merit in the writ petition, which is dismissed, though with no order as to costs.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

10.04.2026
sheetal

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No