



2026:CGHC:3549-DB

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 121 of 2026

Sohail Memon S/o A.R. Memon Aged About 30 Years Proprietor Of Gariyaband
Tour And Travels Having Its Registered Office At Tiranya Chowk Gariyaband,
District : Gariyabandh, Chhattisgarh ... **Petitioner(s)**

versus

**1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through District Collector Gariyaband, District :
Gariyabandh, Chhattisgarh**

2 - Asststant Mining Officer Gariyaband, District : Gariyabandh, Chhattisgarh

**3 - Tender Committee Mining Branch, O/o Collector Gariyaband, District :
Gariyabandh, Chhattisgarh**

**4 - M/s Naman Motors Majarkata Chowk, Gariyaband Main Road, District :
Gariyabandh, Chhattisgarh ...Respondent(s)**

(Cause-title taken from Case Information System)

For Petitioner	: Shri Anirudha Shrivastava, Advocate
For Respondent/State	: Shri Prasun Bhaduri, Dy AG

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Shri Justice Ravindra Kumar Agrawal
Order on Board

Per Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice
21.01.2026

Heard Shri Anirudha Shrivastava, learned counsel for the petitioner.
Also heard Shri Prasun Bhaduri, learned Dy AG, appearing for the
respondent/State.

1. Petitioner has filed the present petition for the following reliefs:-

“10.1 That, this Hon’ble Court may kindly be pleased to issue an appropriate writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ quashing the Work order dated 29.08.2025 issued by the Assistant Mines Officer District Gariyaband (Annexure P6), order dated 29.08.2025 passed by the Assistant Mines Officer District Gariyaband rejecting objection of the petitioner (Annexure P/7) Work agreement dated 02.09.2025 (Annexure P/8).

10.2 That, this Hon’ble Court may kindly be pleased to issue an appropriate writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ directing the respondent authorities to quash and set aside the declaration of the private respondent firm as L1 in the tender process, as it is contrary to the terms and conditions of the tender and the principles of fairness and transparency and direct the respondent authorities to award the contract and issue work order to the petitioner firm.

10.3 That, this Hon’ble Court may kindly be pleased to grant any other relief(s), which is deemed fit and proper in the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case.”

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that though the tender has already been allotted to respondent-4, which is for one year, and already four months have been passed, but as stated by the learned

counsel for the State, said tender can be extended on yearly basis, petitioner would be deprived of getting any further opportunity.

3. Learned State counsel would submit that it is only an apprehension of the petitioner that the tender would be extended on yearly basis which is a premature plea.

4. In view of above, we are not inclined to interfere with the matter at this stage as four months have already been elapsed, and respondent-4 has already been working on the tender.

5. Accordingly, present petition is dismissed with liberty to the petitioner to take recourse to law after one year, if cause of action arises.

Sd/-
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
Judge

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice