



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

132

CWP-12751-2026

Date of Decision: 27.04.2026

SANDEEP KUMAR

...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS.

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Gauravjit Singh Patwalia, Advocate and
Ms. Lagan K. Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. Ishan Kaushal, AAG Punjab

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to Respondents No. 1 to 3 to provide adequate security to him as well as his employees for executing labor work of cluster Faridkot-I & II allotted vide order dated 30.03.2026 and allotment letter dated 16.04.2026.

2. The petitioner under the Labour and Cartage Policy, 2025 applied for clusters Faridkot-I & Faridkot-II. His technical bid was rejected on 13.09.2025 by the Technical Evaluation Committee. He preferred appeal before Director-cum-First Appellate Authority which was dismissed vide order dated 29.01.2026. Aggrieved from order passed in first appeal, he preferred second appeal before the Secretary-cum-Second Appellate Authority who vide order dated 30.03.2026 allowed the

same with a direction to District Tender Committee to consider his technical bid. Respondent No.4-Department of Food, Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs vide letter dated 06.04.2026 found petitioner's technical bid to be correct and directed him to deposit a security amount of Rs. 6,47,875/- qua clusters Faridkot-I & II by way of Demand Draft. Respondent No.5-earlier successful bidder is threatening and physically abusing him. He is threatening that petitioner would not be allowed to execute duly allotted work. The petitioner approached SSP, Faridkot by way of letter dated 15.04.2026 seeking police protection but to no avail.

3. Learned State counsel submits that jurisdictional SSP would look into the petitioner's representation dated 15.04.2026 (Annexure P-3) and resolve his grievance.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner agrees to the aforesaid arrangement.

5. In the wake of statement of both sides, the instant petition stands disposed of. The Court is sanguine that jurisdictional SSP would intervene and endeavour to avoid occurrence of any untoward incident.

6. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

April 27, 2026
Deepak DPA

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No