

HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA : HYDERABAD

MAIN CASE No.: W.P. No.17346 of 2026

PROCEEDING SHEET

| SL. NO. | DATE | ORDER | OFFICE NOTE |
|---------|------------|--|---|
| 01. | 08.06.2026 | <p><u>SN, J</u></p> <p>Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner.</p> <p>This Court opines that the plea puts forth by the petitioner that the condition of eligibility under Clause-3 of Pre-qualification procedure restricts participation of the bidders to a very limited number of bidders is not convincing in view of the written instructions placed before this Court by the 2nd respondent company through its Standing Counsel which is extracted hereunder:</p> <p>“As per SSCL Project Management Consultancy (PMC) by JNTU: Hyderabad has informed the list of institute/company can provide the technology the aerated constructed technology in India vide mail dated 26.05.2026”.</p> <p align="center"><u>The Apex Court in its Judgment dated 21.03.2022 reported in (2022) 6 Supreme Court Cases 127 in “N.G.PROJECTS LIMITED v. VINOD KUMAR JAIN AND OTHERS”, at para 13 observed as under:</u></p> <p>13. ...In contracts involving technical issues, the courts should be even more reluctant because most of us in Judges’ robes do not have the necessary expertise to adjudicate upon technical issues beyond</p> | Transferred to IO folder before corrections, if any |

our domain...”

The Apex Court in its Judgment reported in 1994 (6) SCC Page 651 in Tate Cellular Case at para 94 (4) observed as under:

“94. (4) The terms of the invitation to tender cannot be open to judicial scrutiny because the invitation to tender is in the realm of contract.”

Taking into consideration the view of the Apex Court in the Judgments referred to and extracted above, this Court opines that the present case is not a case for grant of any interim relief.

List the matter on 22.06.2026 for the counter of the respondents.

SN,J

Yvkr