



\$~67

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

%

Date of Decision : 01.04.2026

+ W.P.(C) 3808/2026 CM APPL. 18651/2026

M/S YAMUNA ENTERPRISES

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajesh Gupta and Mr. Harpreet Singh, Advs.

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Kritika Gupta, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J. (ORAL)

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner with the following prayers:-

“(I) Issue a writ in the nature of CERTIORARI and/or any other appropriate writ, order or direction in the like nature quashing the following eight identical (8 identical) IMPUGNED-TENDERS together with respective tender-process (detailed in Sr. No. 1 to 8 of table in Para 5.2 of writ-petition), i.e. Impugned-Tenders namely,-

(a) 1st Impugned Tender- NIT No. 05/SFSC/DDA/2025-26 for Siri Fort Sports Complex, New Delhi (Annexure P-4)

(b) 2nd Impugned Tender - NIT No.



IO/RSC/DDA/2025-26 for Rohini Sports Complex, Sector-14, Rohini, New Delhi (Annexure P-5)

(e) 3rd Impugned-Tender - NIT No. 04/MDCSC/DDA/2025-26 for Major Dhyan Chand Sports Complex (Annexure P-6)

(d) 4th Impugned-Tender - NIT No. 05/RSKP/DDA/2025-26 for Rashtriya Swabhimaan Khel Parisa (Annexure P-7)

(e) 5th Impugned-Tender - NIT No. 06/PVSC/DDA/2025-26 for Paschim Vihar Sports Complex (Annexure P-8)

(f) 6th Impugned-Tender - NIT No. 09/HNSC/DDA/2025-26 for HariNagar Sports Complex, Delhi (Annexure P-9)

(g) 7th Impugned-Tender - NIT No. 14/PDKP/DDA/2025-26 for Poorv Delhi Khel Parisar (Annexure P-10)

(h) 8th Impugned-Tender - NIT No. 02/DSC/DDA/2025-26 for Dwarka Sports Complex, New Delhi (Annexure P-11)

(II) Issue writ of MANDAMUS and/or any other writ, order or direction in the like nature directing respondent/DDA to re-tender the works under 'Impugned-Tenders' (supra) after clarifying the terms & conditions and eligibility criteria.

(III) Award costs of the writ petition in favour of the petitioner."

2. On 25.03.2026, we had passed the following order:-

"1. The learned counsel for the respondents has filed an additional short affidavit on behalf of the respondents i.e., DDA, which is taken on record. The same is scanned and made part of the present writ petition.

2. We have heard the learned counsels for the parties.

3. It is made clear and so stated by Mr. Gupta, learned counsel for the petitioner that this writ petition lays challenge to the disqualification of the petitioner qua



Tender@ Sr. No. 7 i.e. NIT No. 14/PDKP/DDA/2025-26 for Poorv Delhi Khel Parisar.

4. We may clarify that the technical bids of the petitioner with regard to other seven tenders have not been opened, yet.

5. At request of the learned counsel for the respondents to take instructions, renotify on 01.04.2026.”

3. The aforesaid order was passed in the context that the petitioner has challenged the action of the respondents in respect of 08 tenders but the fact as represented by the counsel for the respondents is that only 01 tender i.e., 7th impugned tender with regard to Poorv Delhi Khel Parishar was opened, we are limiting our consideration to the issue regarding the 7th tender only.

4. One of the grounds urged by Mr. Rajesh Gupta, learned counsel for the petitioner is that the respondents have rejected the tender of the petitioner on the ground that it has not filed the net worth certificate based on the audited accounts of relevant financial year i.e., 2024-25. The submission of Mr. Gupta is that there are other bidders, who have not fulfilled the stipulation but their bids have been accepted by the respondent/DDA.

5. On this, the learned counsel for the respondents has taken instructions and also filed an affidavit today in Court, which we take on record.

6. The learned counsel for the respondents would submit that though the net worth certificates submitted by the tenderers, does not specifically state that the said certificate is based on audited accounts, but the Chartered Accountant having verified the accounts, the same have been accepted. She states that the said certificates would not be strictly in accordance with the provisions of the NIT. She highlight the stand of the DDA in paragraph 4 of



the affidavit.

7. On this, Mr. Gupta would submit that similar should be the position in respect of other tenders.

8. We say nothing on the said submission of Mr. Gupta. Suffice to state insofar as the impugned tender is concerned, the stand of the respondent/DDA is that they shall strictly follow terms of the NIT, which means the net worth certificate should be as per the audited accounts for the relevant Financial Year 2024-25. By taking the submission/stand of the respondents on record, we dispose of this petition and the pending application.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

APRIL 1, 2026/sr