



\$~84

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

+ W.P.(C) 4/2026 and CM APPL. 9/2026, CM APPL. 10/2026

M/S HEADSTAR CONSTRUCTION COPetitioner

Through: Mr Nikhil Saini, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANRRespondents

Through: Mr.Ruchir Mishrra, Mr.Sanjiv Kr Saxena, Mr.Mukesh Kr Tiwari, Ms.Reba Jena Mishra and Ms.Poonam Shukla, Advocates for UOI..

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

% **18.03.2026**

1. The petitioner may be correct in contending that there were two Notice Inviting Tenders ('NITs'), and pursuant to which the petitioner was awarded two different works. However, the fact remains that owing to the alleged non-completion of the work, the respondent-Authority *vide* Office Memorandum dated 25.11.2025 have passed a common order for debarment. Once the common order of debarment has been passed, it was not incumbent upon the petitioner to have filed two writ petitions.

2. In the instant writ petition, learned counsel for petitioner tries to bifurcate the issues on the premises that there were two different works. The same is not acceptable when the order impugned is the same in both the



writ petitions.

3. Additionally, it be noted that the same impugned order is the subject matter of the W. P. (C) 19471/2025. It remains insignificant as to whether the same was with respect to different work. So long as the same impugned order is under challenge the petitioner was not required to file separate writ petition.

4. For all the aforesaid reasons, the instant petition against the same impugned order, which is also impugned in W. P. (C) 19471/2025, is not found to be maintainable and is, accordingly, dismissed. The pending applications also stands dismissed.

5. However, the petitioner may continue to prosecute the other writ petition i.e. W. P. (C) 19471/2025.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J

MARCH 18, 2026

aks