

HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI**MAIN CASE No: W.P.No.8223 of 2025****PROCEEDING SHEET**

Sl. No.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
03.	04.04.2025	<u>KM, J</u> Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, Sri M.R.K Chakravarthy. Learned Government Pleader for Endowments takes notice for the respondent Nos.1 to 3. Sri P. Ram, learned Standing Counsel takes notice for the respondent Nos.4 & 5. The grievance of the petitioner is that the petitioner participated in the e-Procurement tender process for supply of man power on outsourcing basis to the 4th respondent Temple for a period of one (01) year from 01.03.2025 to 28.02.2026 and the petitioner was declared as successful bidder <i>vide</i> proceedings of the 4th & 5th respondent, dated 18.02.2025. The 5th respondent has submitted proposals to the 2nd respondent seeking approval to allot license in favour of the petitioner. However, <i>vide</i> the impugned proceedings of the Commissioner, the 2nd respondent herein has informed the 5th	(Contd...)

		respondent of the proposal to go the centralized tender process for all Joint Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner cadre Temples, thus the Executive Officer was asked to defer till finalization of the said centralized tender process meanwhile, continue with the previous agencies. Till finalization of the centralized tenders. Learned Government Pleader appearing for the respondents referring to Clause 13, 14 (5 & 6) of the tender document argues that the Executive Officer is the appropriate authority, either to relax any of the conditions regarding to e-Procurement tender and right to accept or reject bids. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that there is a lapse on the part of the respondents in awarding contract even after declaring the petitioner as successful bidder and the petitioner has incurred substantial sums in the process. He relies on the decision of this Court in the case of <i>Subodh Kumar Singh Rathour Vs. The Chief Executive Officer & others</i>¹ and contends that the action of the respondents action is arbitrary in deferring the issuance of contract, after the tender process is	(Contd...)
--	--	--	------------

¹ Civil Appeal No.6741 of 2024

		concluded, on the pretext that they might opt for different procedure of tender process viz., centralization of the tender system. He argues that such unilateral actions would cause financial prejudice to the petitioner. Having regard to the same, learned counsel for the petitioner prays the Court to direct the respondent to allot work in terms of tender, since he is declared as the successful bidder. Considering the submissions advanced, there shall be interim direction as prayed, for a period of eight (08) weeks from today. Post on 20.06.2025, for counters of the respondents. KM, J MSI	
--	--	---	--

