

GAHC010035882025



undefined

THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)

Case No. : WP(C)/1011/2025

M/S MEGHALAYA CONSTRUCTTON AND SUPPLY COMPANY
A PARTNERSHIP FIRM HAVING ITS HEAD OFFICE AT PATAN TEHSIL NEEM
KA THANA DISTRICT SIKAR RAJASTHAN ,
REPRESENTED BY ITS PARTNER SUNIL DEWAN , AGE 50 YRS.,
S/O- LATE MADAN LAL DEWAN,

RESIDENT OF 124 TULSI RAM MARG GURU JAMBESHWAR NAGAR,
VAISHALI NAGAR, JAIPUR RAJASTHAN-302021

VERSUS

HINDUSTAN STEELWORKS CONSTRUCTION LIMITED AND ORS
REPRESENTED BY THE HEAD CPG ,
HEAD OFFICE AT 3RD FLOOR NBCC SQUARE PLOT NO III F2 ACTION
AREA III NEW TOWN, RAJARHAT,
P.O- AKANDAKESHARI, KOLKATA, PIN-700135

2:THE HEAD CPG HINDUSTAN CONSTRUCTION LIMITED
3RD FLOOR NBCC SQUARE PLOT NO III F2 ACTION AREA III NEW TOWN
RAJARHAT

P.O AKANDAKESHARI
KOLKATA
PIN-700135

3:THE UNION OF INDIA
REP. BY THE MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS
NEW DELHI-01

4:THE ZONAL HEAD NE HINDUSTAN STEEL WORKS CONSTRUCTION
LIMITED
H/O -TRIDIB KUMAR BORKAKOTY

1ST FLOOR
AEC ROAD
JALUKBARI
GUWAHATI-1

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR RAB HUSSAIN, MR A A AHMED, MRS. S ROY, MR. A BISWAS

Advocate for the Respondent : DY.S.G.I.,

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOUMITRA SAIKIA

ORDER

Date : 21.02.2025

Heard Mr. R. Hussain, learned counsel for the petitioner. Also heard Mr. H. Gupta, learned CGC for the respondent no.3.

This writ petition has been filed putting to challenge the rejection of the petitioner, in the Technical Bid Evaluation undertaken by the respondent of Hindustan Steelworks Construction Limited.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the Technical Bid Evaluation summary shows that out of 5 (five) intending bidders only 1 (one) stood qualified. In so far as the writ petitioner is concerned in it's the bid was disqualified due to "non submission of valid EMD in favour of Hindustan Steelworks Construction Limited".

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits all necessary documents were uploaded on 25.12.2014 via online portal.

He therefore submits that this rejection and intended Technical Bid Evaluation is contrary to the tender evaluation condition and he has been

wrongly rejected notwithstanding his submission of the EMD. Being aggrieved he is before this Court.

Let the notice issued, returnable within 2 (two) weeks.

Steps on respondent nos. 1, 2 & 3 by registered post with A/D as well as usual course within 1 (one) week from today. Dasti also permitted.

Since the respondent no. 3 represented by the learned CGC, notices are waived. However, extra copies be furnished within the course of this week.

Issued notice on the interim prayer.

Let the matter be listed again on 17.03.2025.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant