SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			WPMB/895/2026 Harendra Singh Negi --Petitioner **Versus** State of Uttarakhand & others --Respondents **Hon'ble Manoj Kumar Tiwari, A.C.J.** **Hon'ble Subhash Upadhyay, J.** Mr. Jitendra Chaudhary, learned Senior Counsel assisted by Ms. Neeti Rana, learned counsel for the petitioner. 2. Mr. B.S. Parihar, learned Additional C.S.C. with Mr. Ranjan Ghildiyal, learned Standing Counsel for the State of Uttarakhand/respondents. 3. Public Works Department invited bids from interested bidders by issuing NIT. Petitioner submitted bid pursuant to said tender notice. According to petitioner, he was declared as a lowest bidder and, thereafter, negotiations were also held. 4. By means of this writ petition, petitioner has sought following reliefs:- *"(i). Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of certiorari, quashing and setting aside the impugned order dated 05.10.2026 (Annexure no. 1 Page No.17 to page no.17 of the writ petition), passed by Respondent No. 5, whereby the tender relating to the construction of a T.O. Quarter at Narendra Nagar under the Deposit Scheme has been cancelled.* *(ii). Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of certiorari, quashing the Government Order dated 28.09.2026 (Annexure no.7 Page No.58 to page no.58 of the writ petition), insofar as it relates to the transfer of execution of the work of construction of a T.O. Quarter at Narendra Nagar under the Deposit Scheme from the Public Works Department to the Irrigation Department.* *(iii) Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent authorities to act fairly and in accordance with the applicable tender conditions, procurement rules and principles of non-arbitrariness while taking any further decision concerning the aforesaid work.*

			(IV) any other writ order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may be fit and proper under the circumstances of the case. *(V) award the cost of petition to the petitioner."* 5. Petitioner is aggrieved by cancellation of the tender process vide Notification dated 05.10.2026 issued by Executive Engineer, Construction Division (PWD), Narendra Nagar. 6. Learned State Counsel, however, submits that State Government had initially nominated Public Works Department as the construction agency, however, the work was withdrawn from State Public Works Department and it has now been assigned to Irrigation Department. He, therefore, submits that tender process would be initiated afresh by the new agency which is nominated i.e. the Irrigation Department. 7. Having regard to the fact that work has been withdrawn from Public Works Department and it has been assigned to Irrigation Department, we do not find any scope for interference in the matter. 8. Law is well settled that mere submission of offer in response to an invitation to offer does not result in a concluded contract. The competent authority can always cancel the tender process for valid reasons. The reason indicated by learned State Counsel is valid and call for no interference. 9. Writ petition is, accordingly, dismissed. **(Subhash Upadhyay, J.)** **(Manoj Kumar Tiwari, A.C.J.)** 29.10.2026 29.10.2026 SS/PP