



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA
PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI
(Special Original Jurisdiction)**

[3460]

WEDNESDAY, THE TWENTY SECOND DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE NYAPATHY VIJAY

WRIT PETITION NO: 10526/2026

Between:

1.M/S. KANAKA DURGA MANPOWER SERVICES,, REP. BY
ITS PROPRIETOR CHOWDARY NAIDU.M, C/O. SRINU,
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS, R/O. D.NO. 12-GF105, FIRST
FLOOR,GARUDA APARTMENT, VIJAYAWADA BYPASS,
TADEPALLI, GUNTUR DISTRICT. -522501.

...PETITIONER

AND

1.THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER
EDUCATION, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, GUNTUR
DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH. -522238

2.THE RAJIV GANDHI UNIVERSITY OF KNOWLEDGE
TECHNOLOGIES, REP. BY ITS DIRECTOR, ONGOLE
CAMPUS, SANTHANUTHALAPADU (V AND M)
PRAKASAM DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH. -523225

3.THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, RAJIV GANDHI
UNIVERSITY OF KNOWLEDGE TECHNOLOGIES
ONGOLE CAMPUS, SANTHANUTHALAPADU (V AND M),
PRAKASAM DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH. - 523225

...RESPONDENT(S):

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed therewith, the High Court may be pleased to issue a writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of WRIT OF MANDAMUS declaring the action of the Respondents in disqualifying the Petitioners Technical Bid pursuant to Tender Notification No. RGUKT/ONG/Outsourcing/Man Power/2025-26 dated 02.02.2026, on the sole ground of non-submission of physical copies despite complete online submission through the e-Procurement portal, as illegal, arbitrary and violative of Articles 14 and 19(1)(g) of the Constitution of India, and consequently direct the Respondents to reconsider the Petitioners bid on merits and permit participation in further stages of the tender process, and to pass such

IA NO: 1 OF 2026

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to direct the Respondents not to finalize the tender process or award the contract and not to create any third-party rights pursuant to Tender Notification No. RGUKT/ONG/Outsourcing/Man Power/2025-26 dated 02.02.2026, and to pass such

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. KISHORE KUMAR KATARI

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

The Court made the following:

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE NYAPATHY VIJAY**W.P.No.10526 of 2026****O R D E R:**

This writ petition is filed declaring the action of Respondents in disqualifying the Petitioner's Technical Bid pursuant to Tender Notification No.RGUKT / ONG / Outsourcing / Man Power / 2025-26 dated 02.02.2026 as illegal and arbitrary.

2. The Respondent-University had issued tender to provide man power services at their campus at Ongole. Petitioner participated in the tender and had uploaded the documents online. However, the technical bid of the Petitioner was rejected on the ground that he did not submit the physical copies. Questioning the same, the present writ petition is filed.

3. Learned standing counsel for the Respondent-University submits that an e-mail was communicated to the Petitioner on 14.03.2026 explaining the reasons for rejection of the technical bid and a copy of the same is placed before the Court.

4. Learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that as the

documents are filed online, hard copies need not be submitted and therefore, the rejection is unsustainable.

5. The tender notification specifically provides that the last date for submission of the documents of hard copies as 23.02.2026-2.00 p.m. to the Administrative Officer-Respondent No.3. This condition was also referred under Section 1(5) of the tender notification, wherein it is mentioned that after uploading the documents of technical bid along with original payment details, documents should be submitted offline to Administrative Officer of Respondent No.3-University.

6. Admittedly, the Petitioner did not furnish the hard copies in terms of the specific clauses of the tender notification.

7. In the absence of submission of hard copies as specified in the tender notification, the rejection of the technical bid cannot be faulted as there was no bid in true sense, in terms of the tender. Secondly, the rejection of the tender was communicated on 14.03.2026 and the writ petition is filed a month later. In the interregnum, it is stated that on 02.04.2026, the letter of intent was issued to M/s. Shakti Security &

Maintenance Services Pvt. Ltd., who was declared to be the L1 bidder for the tender in question.

8. In the light of the same, this Court does not find any merit in the writ petition and the same is accordingly dismissed. No order as to costs.

As a sequel, the miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this Petition shall stand closed.

NYAPATHY VIJAY, J

Date: 22.04.2026
KLP