



\$~5

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

W.P.(C) 3894/2026 & CM APPL. 19105/2026

M/S VATIKA BUSINESS CENTRE

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shriram Nagayach,
Advocate.

versus

M/S INDIA POST PAYMENTS BANK LTD.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Ajay Shanker, Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

13.04.2026

1. Through the present petition, the Petitioner has essentially challenged its disqualification from the tender process.
2. Pertinently, the Petitioner has not impleaded the successful bidder in whose favour the contract has been awarded.
3. Moreover, the Petitioner's bid was technically disqualified on the following ground:

"Copies of all applicable documents mentioned as below: - Copy of Sale/purchased /conveyance deed/Title/Lease deed holder documents of the offered space/ land/ building duly registered with the registrar in the name of bidder with all description if applicable. 1. Offered Space Document No. IN-UP56942097657340X dated 22.09.2025 is unregistered and offers a lease term as well as a lock-in period that fall short of the tender-mandated 9 years and 5 years respectively."

4. The learned counsel representing the Petitioner does not dispute the aforesaid position. However, he submits that now the Petitioner is prepared to make an offer on the terms as desired by the Respondent.
5. The tender was issued for hiring of back-office space. The



tender submitted by the Petitioner was not in accordance with the requirements. Once the Petitioner has failed to submit the tender as per the requirement, the rejection of its tender cannot be termed as arbitrary or without any reason.

6. Hence, no ground is made out to issue the writ on merits as well as on account of failure of the Petitioner to implead the necessary party. Pending application also stands disposed of.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

APRIL 13, 2026

DV