



2026:DHC:2370



\$~40, 41, 43 and 46

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

Date of Decision: **16.03.2026**

IN THE MATTERS OF:

40

+ **W.P.(C) 14290/2024 and CM APPL. 69348/2024, CM APPL. 15772/2026**

M/S 6X

.....Petitioner

Through: Rajat Gaur & B S Mathur Advocates.
versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr.Rohan Jaitley CGSC, Mr.Akshay Sharma, Mr.Dev Pratap Shahi, Mr. Varun Pratap Singh Advocates for UOI.
Mr Premtosh K Mishra CGSC, Mr Shrey Sharma, Mr Anubhav Upadhyay Advocates.
Ms.Shweta Bharti, Ms.Tejaswini Chandrasekhar, Ms. Sonali Khanna, Mr.Jatin Chaddha, Ms. Mehak , Advocates, for respondent/ GeM.

41

+ **W.P.(C) 15749/2024**

M/S GANPATI INTERGLOBE PVT. LTD.

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr Rana S Biswas, Kartik Chettiar and Yash Tirpathi Advocates.

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:AMIT KUMAR
SHARMA
Signing Date:20.03.2026
17:11:26

Signature Not Verified
Signed
By:PURUSHAINDRA
KUMAR KAURAV



versus

UNION OF INDIA GOVERNMENT E-MARKET
PLACE & ORS.

....Respondents

Through: Ms.Shweta Bharti, Ms.Tejaswini
Chandrasekhar, Ms. Sonali Khanna,
Mr.Jatin Chaddha, Ms. Mehak ,
Advocates, for respondent/ GeM.

43

+

**W.P.(C) 590/2025 and CM APPL. 2779/2025, CM APPL.
15774/2026**

M/S VINAYAK MANUFACTURERS PVT. LTDPetitioner

Through: Mr Rana S Biswas, Kartik Chettiar,
and Yash Tirpathi Advocates.

versus

GOVERNMENT E-MARKET PLACE & ORS.Respondents

Through: Ms.Shweta Bharti, Ms.Tejaswini
Chandrasekhar, Ms. Sonali Khanna,
Mr.Jatin Chaddha, Ms. Mehak ,
Advocates, for respondent/ GeM.

46

+

**W.P.(C) 1645/2025 and CM APPL. 7977/2025, CM APPL.
15776/2026**

M/S JAI BALAJI INDUSTRY THROUGH ITS SOLE
PROPRIETOR MRS. PRIYANKA AGARWALPetitioner

Through: Mr Rana S Biswas, Kartik Chettiar
and Yash Tirpathi Advocates.

versus

GOVERNMENT E-MARKET PLACE
THROUGH ITS AUTHORIZED



REPRESENTATIVE & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms.Shweta Bharti, Ms.Tejaswini Chandrasekhar, Ms. Sonali Khanna, Mr.Jatin Chaddha, Ms. Mehak , Advocates, for respondent/ GeM.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

J U D G E M E N T

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J. (ORAL)

1. In all the afore-captioned writ petitions, the decisions passed in appeals are under challenge. The sole ground is that the same are non-speaking.
2. This submission was noted on last date and accordingly it was directed to bring on record, the minutes of meeting, if it contained any reasons.
3. The subsequent documents which have been placed on record do not disclose any adjudication of the issues raised by the petitioners.
4. The documents only indicate that certain comments were forwarded for approval to the higher authorities. They do not reveal any adjudication to the contentions urged by the petitioners, nor do they indicate the reasons for which the petitioners' submissions came to be rejected.
5. Learned counsel for the petitioners has placed reliance on the order passed in *M/s Mishthi Industries Private Limited Thr. Director Vedansh Garg vs. Union of India and Ors.*¹ stating that an administrative or quasi-judicial order, particularly one entailing adverse civil consequences, must be supported by intelligible reasons.



6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, this Court is of the opinion that, in the absence of cogent reasons for rejection of the appeals, the impugned decisions cannot be sustained in law. Merely placing of subsequent documents would not cure the foundational defect of absence of reasons in the impugned orders. The Supreme Court in case of *Mohinder Singh Gill v. Chief Election Commissioner*² has unequivocally held that that when a statutory authority makes an order, its validity must be tested solely on the reasons recorded therein, and such reasons cannot be supplemented or improved upon subsequently by way of affidavits or otherwise. The said principle underscores the requirement of transparency, fairness and accountability in administrative decision-making, which is a facet of Article 14 of the Constitution.

7. Applying the aforesaid settled position of law, this Court finds that the impugned decisions, being bereft of reasons and sought to be justified subsequently, are unsustainable and are, hereby, set aside.

8. The petition, stands, disposed of.

9. The liberty is granted to the respondent(s) to pass a fresh order after granting opportunity of hearing to the petitioners.

10. All rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

(PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV)
JUDGE

MARCH 16, 2026/aks/ss.

¹ Writ Petition No. 30663/2024, Order dated 26.11.2024

² (1978) 1 SCC 405