

HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD

**THURSDAY, THE THIRTIETH DAY OF APRIL,
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX**

:PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MRS JUSTICE SUREPALLI NANDA

**I.A.No. 1 OF 2026
IN
WP NO: 14828 OF 2026**

Between

M/s. NACOF, Having its Branch Office at. 5-10-193, 2nd floor, 40/201, HACA Bhavan, Opp Public Gardens, Basheer Bagh, Hyderabad, Telangana, 500 004 Rep. by its Authorised representative, Bellamkonda Joshi Nagababu S/o. Subba rao, Aged about. 38 years, Occ. Private Employee, R/o. 2-198, Antarvedi Kara, Kotta Vantena, Antarvedi, Sakshinetipalli, East Godavari, Andhra Pradesh, 533 252

...Petitioner

(Petitioner in WP NO: 14828 OF 2026
on the file of High Court)

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Represented by its Principal Secretary, Agriculture and Cooperation Department, Secretariat Building, Hyderabad - 500 022
2. The Telangana State Co-operative Marketing Federation Ltd, Represented by its Managing Director, 5-2-68, 3rd Floor, Mahatma Gandhi Markfed Bhavan, Jambhahg, Hyderabad, 500 095

...Respondents

(Respondents in-do-)

Counsel for the Petitioner: Sri D. Prakash Reddy rep. M/s. D Madhavi

Counsel for the Respondent No.1: Government Pleader for Cooperation

Counsel for the Respondent No.2: Sri P. Vishnu, SC for TSCOMFL

Petition under Section 151 of C.P.C praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to suspend the operation of the Impugned Proceedings dated 28.04.2026 issued by Respondent No.2, and consequently direct the Respondent No.2 to consider the bid submitted by the Petitioner under e-Tender ID No. 692946, subject to the outcome of

the present Writ Petition, pending disposal of WP No 14828 of 2026, on the file of the High Court.

The Court made the following

ORDER

Head Sri D.Prakash Reddy, learned senior designated counsel representing Smt D.Madhavi, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner on record and Sri Pole Vishnu, learned standing counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent No.2

The petitioner approached the Court seeking interim relief in the present writ petition is as under:-

".....to suspend the operation of the impugned proceedings dated 28.04.2026 issued by respondent No.2 and consequently direct the respondent No.2 to consider the bid submitted by the petitioner under e-Tender ID No.692946, subject to the outcome of the present writ petition, pending disposal of the above writ petition...."

Learned senior designated counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner mainly puts-forth the following submissions:-

- i) In response to the notice, dated 27.04.2026 issued by the respondent No.2 to the petitioner herein seeking certain clarification and documentary proof, the petitioner submitted a detailed explanation, dated 28.04.2026 to the 2nd respondent herein.
- ii) But however without considering the petitioner's explanation, dated 28.04.2026 submitted by the petitioner in response to the show-cause notice, dated 27.04.2026 issued to the petitioner herein.
- iii) The only ground raised in the impugned rejection proceedings vide Rc.No./P&M/Disposal of Maize Vanakalam 2025-26, dated 28.04.2026 of the 2nd respondent is that the petitioner's firm's security deposit was forfeited by the consumer Affairs, Food & Civil Supplies (CS.I.CRP) Department vide G O.Ms.No.15, dated

09.09.2025 and therefore, the bid submitted by the petitioner's firm under e-Tender ID:692946 had been rejected.

- iv) Forfeiture of Rs.65.90 crores from security deposit of the petitioner's firm for non lifting of auctioned paddy on pro-rata basis is an order passed in violation of principles of natural justice without prior notice to the petitioner herein and hence, the said proceedings, dated 09.09.2025 cannot be the ground for issuing the impugned rejection proceedings, dated 28.04.2026.
- v) The 2nd respondent had acted solely on the basis of allegations contained in the complaint, dated 24.04.2026 without undertaking any independent verification of the correctness authenticity or legal status of the said allegations.

Based on the aforesaid submissions, learned senior designated counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner is entitled for the interim relief as prayed for by the petitioner in the present writ petition.

A bare perusal of the record indicates that in response to the notice, dated 27.04.2026 issued to the petitioner herein by the 2nd respondent herein, the petitioner submitted a detailed explanation, dated 28.04.2026 clarifying the allegations of blacklisting levelled against the petitioner's firm.

A bare perusal of the impugned rejection proceedings, dated 28.04.2026 of the 2nd respondent curiously does not discuss the several pleas put-froth by the petitioner herein, in petitioner's explanation, dated 28.04.2026 furnished to the 2nd respondent in response to the show-cause notice, dated 27.04.2026 issued by the 2nd respondent to the petitioner, but however on the ground that the security deposit of the petitioner's firm had been forfeited by the consumer Affairs, Food & Civil Supplies (CS.I.CRP) Department vide G.O.Ms.No.15, dated 09.09.2025, the impugned rejection proceedings, dated 28.04.2026 had been issued

to the petitioner herein on the basis of complaint received pertaining to submission of documents and participation in the e-tender process for disposal of Maize (vanakalam/Kharif 2025-26) under e-tender ID:692946.

Admittedly, as borne on record, it is evident that the specific pleas put-forth by the petitioner in the detailed explanation, dated 28.04.2026 furnished by the petitioner in response to the show-cause notice, dated 27.04.2026 issued by the 2nd respondent herein had not been considered, since there is no reference in the impugned rejection proceedings, dated 28.04.2026 of the 2nd respondent herein pertaining to the same nor any discussion and solely only on the ground that the petitioner's firm security deposit had been forfeited by the consumer Affairs, Food & Civil Supplies (CS.I.CRP) Department vide G.O.Ms.No.15, dated 09.09.2025, the petitioner is informed that the bid submitted by the petitioner's firm under e-tender ID:692946 had been rejected.

This Court prima-facie opines the order impugned had been passed hastily, without application of mind, without taking into consideration the specific plea of the petitioner that the security deposit of the petitioner had been forfeited by the consumer Affairs, Food & Civil Supplies (CS.I.CRP) Department vide G.O.Ms.No.15, dated 09.09.2025 unilaterally without affording a reasonable opportunity to the petitioner to put-forth petitioner's defence, and the explanation furnished by the petitioner, dated 28.04.2026 in response to the show-cause notice, dated 27.04.2026 issued by the 2nd respondent had admittedly been totally ignored.

This Court opines that the petitioner is entitled for the grant of interim relief as prayed for by the petitioner in the present writ petition and the respondent No.2 is therefore directed to consider the bid submitted by the petitioner's firm under e-tender ID:692946 without reference to the impugned proceedings vide Rc.No./P&M/Disposal of Maize Vanakalam 2025-26, dated

28.04.2026 of the 2nd respondent. However, the subject tender shall not be finalized till 06.05.2026.

**Sd/- AHMAD ABDULLA KHAN
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR**

//TRUE COPY//


SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The Principal Secretary, Agriculture and Cooperation Department, State of Telangana, Secretariat Building, Hyderabad - 500 022. —
2. The Managing Director, Telangana State Co-operative Marketing Federation Ltd, 5-2-68, 3rd Floor, Mahatma Gandhi Markfed Bhavan. Jambhahg, Hyderabad, 500 095[Addresses 1 & 2 by SPAD] —
3. One CC to Sri. D MADHAVI Advocate [OPUC] —
4. Two CCs to GP FOR COOPERATION, High Court for the State of Telangana, at Hyderabad [OUT] —
5. One spare copy —

HIGH COURT

SN, J

DATED: 30-04-2026

LIST ON 06.05.2026

ORDER

**I.A.No. 1 OF 2026
IN
WP NO: 14828 OF 2026**

DIRECTION

