



\$~18

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

+ **W.P.(C) 13600/2022**

MODERN CONSTRUCTION

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Neeraj Bhardwaj, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Amit Tiwari, CGSC with Mr. Chetanya Puri, Mr. Kushagra Malil, Ms. Ayushi Srivastava, Mr. Ayush Tanwar, Mr. Arpan Narwal, Mr. Kushagra Malik, Mr. Ujjwal Tyagi, Advs. and Mr. Bankim Chandra, UDC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

15.04.2026

(The matter has been taken up today, as 14.04.2026 was declared as a holiday on account of birthday of Dr. B.R. Ambedkar.)

1. The instant petition has been filed seeking following reliefs:

“It is therefore prayed that a writ of mandamus and I or any other appropriate Writ, order or direction for Quashing / setting aside the order / letter dated 30.12.2021 issued by Executive Engineer (E), W & TLQA, CPWD 0/0 ADG (RD), Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi be passed and thereby directing the respondents to consider the application of petitioner for Enlistment in Class III Composite Category in CPWD panel and the Petitioner be enlisted in Class III Composite Category of CPWD panel.

Cost of the petition be also awarded

Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court deems fit and proper be also passed in the interest of justice.”



2. The Court had earlier directed the petitioner to take instructions with respect to the submissions made by the respondents.
3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner prays that hearing be deferred on the ground that he could not be able to establish the contact with the petitioner.
4. The Court, however, finds that the submissions made by the respondents on earlier date seem to be reasonable. The petition is against the order dated 30.12.2021. The petitioner enlistment of contractor in Class III Composite Category in Central Public Works Department (CPWD) was rejected. Even assuming that the entitlement was illegal, the same will have to be directed to be reconsidered and the fresh order will have to be passed prospectively.
5. Bearing in mind all those aspects, it is directed that the petitioner to apply afresh. Let his application be considered without being adversely influenced by the earlier rejection. If the petitioner places on record the proof of the payment for registration, let he be not subjected to fresh payment for registration fees.
6. With all these observations, the instant petition stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

APRIL 15, 2026/SH