



\$~98

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

W.P.(C) 4575/2026 and CM APPL. 22276/2026

M/S RAJENDER TOURIST THROUGH ITS PROPRIETOR
MR AJAY VASHISHTPetitioner

Through: Ms. Ritika Gambhir Kohli, Ms.
Kritika Khurana, Mr. Tushar
Mudgil, Mr. Kushank Garg,
Ms. Akshaya Ganpath, Ms.
Saumya Tiwari and Mr. Ahmar
Shad, Advs.

versus

DIRECTORATE OF EDUCATION & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Dhruv Rohatgi, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

07.04.2026

1. The Petitioner prays for quashing Clause 4(c) of the Request for Proposal ['RFP'] issued on 30.03.2026 for appointing Event Management/Production Agency for hiring hotels in order to provide accommodation to players and officials participating in National School Games to be held between 15.04.2026 to 23.04.2026.

2. The Petitioner claims that it has been rendered illegible in view of Clause 4(c) of the RFP, which reads as under:-

“c) The RFP is restricted to the empaneled event management agencies shortlisted vide Order No. F.42(16)/DE/PE&NTEMA/2024-25/2522-34 dated 28.10.2025.”

3. It is the case of the Petitioner that it had no knowledge of the empanelled list or about when it was prepared.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel representing the Respondents has produced a copy of the list of empanelled Event Management Companies dated 28.10.2025, which was prepared pursuant to the e-tender for empanelment of Event Management



Companies, published on 14.08.2025. This communication contained a list of 13 Event Management Companies which were empanelled for a period of one year, having validity till 29.10.2026.

5. Learned counsel representing the Petitioner submits that exclusion of the Petitioner from participating in the tender process is arbitrary as the Petitioner had previously successfully completed such an award. She submits that now a new condition has been added in order to oust the Petitioner.

6. This Court has considered the submissions.

7. Learned counsel representing the Respondents has pointed out that services of these Event Management Companies are required at a very short notice, hence, a conscious decision was taken to empanel the Event Management Companies and an e-tender was issued in August, 2025, however, the Petitioner never applied.

8. Having considered the submissions, this Court does not find it appropriate to interfere particularly while the Petitioner failed to apply when Empanelment of Event Management Companies was carried out in the months of August 2025, September 2025 and October 2025. The Petitioner is not justified to contend that he has been wrongly excluded from participating in the tender process since the Petitioner missed the bus when it had an opportunity to do so.

9. Thus, there is no ground to interfere and the present Petition, along with pending application, is dismissed.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J.

APRIL 07, 2026/sp/kb