



NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 404 of 2026

1 - Hsr Transport Through Its Proprietor Shamid Khan, S/o Munawar Khan, Aged About 38 Years, R/o Nagabuda, Tahsil Bindranawagarh (Gariyaband), District Gariyaband Chhattisgarh

... Petitioner

versus

1 - Chhattisgarh State Civil Supplies Corporation Limited Through its Managing Director, Block No. 7A, 2nd Floor, Office Complex, Sector 24, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur, Chhattisgarh

2 - Managing Director Chhattisgarh State Civil Supplies Corporation Limited, Block No. 7a, 2nd Floor, Office Complex, Sector 24, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur, Chhattisgarh

3 - Chhattisgarh State Civil Supplies Corporation Limited Through District Manager, District Kabirdham Chhattisgarh

4 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Food Civil Supplies And Consumer Protection Department, Mahanadi Bhawan Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh

5 - Hirwani Construction And Services Through Its Partner Abhishek Narayan Sahu, S/o Moti Lal Sahu, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Rajim, Tahsil And Post Rajim, District Gariyaband C.G.

6 - Tender Committee Through Collector, District Gariyaband C.G.

... Respondents

Order Sheet

30-01-2026	Mr. Manoj Paranjpe, Senior Advocate with Mr. Anshul Tiwari, Advocate for the petitioner. Mr. Syed Majid Ali, Advocate for respondents No.1 to 3. Mr. Praveen Das, Addl. Advocate General for the State. Heard on I.A. No.01/2026, application for grant of interim stay. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is challenging the award of tender to respondent No.5 who declared L1 ignoring the tender documents submitted by the petitioner and his price bid has been rejected. However, in the declaration/undertaking submitted by respondent No.5 the affidavit sworn on 01-11-2025 in which he declared that he has already deposited the security deposit on 04-11-2025, i.e., subsequent date of swearing the

affidavit. On the same defect of the tender document of respondent No.5 the same was allowed to participate in tender, whereas on the same condition in other district the tender document of the petitioner have been rejected. In the present tender price bid of the petitioner has been rejected in view to allot the tender to respondent No.5. Petitioner is L2 and if there is any deficiency in the document of respondent No.5, the bid of respondent No.5 would be rejected, then the petitioner would be declared as L1.

On the other hand, learned counsel for respondents No.1 to 3 appearing on advance copy would submit that the petitioner's bid was not rejected on the ground of deficiency in any document and the petitioner as well as respondent No.5 were permitted to participate in the technical bid and they have qualified for price bid. Since the petitioner has been declared L2, he raised such dispute. Therefore, he is not entitled for any relief.

We have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the documents annexed with the petition.

On being pointed query made by the parties, they submitted that the though respondent No.5 has been declared L1, but work order has not been issued till date.

Considering the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and the facts and circumstances of the case, purely as interim measure it is ordered that

	further proceeding of the subject tender shall be kept in abeyance and work order shall not be issued till the next date of hearing. Issue notice to respondent No.5. P.F. and copies within 3 days. Notice be made returnable within two weeks. List this case on 17-02-2026. In the meantime, the parties may exchange their pleadings. Sd/- (Ravindra Kumar Agrawal) Judge Sd/- (Ramesh Sinha) Chief Justice
--	---