

Item No. P-1

Ajay Kumar Sharma Vs. State of Himachal Pradesh & others.

CWP No. 16498 of 2025

17.10.2025 Present: Mr. Naresh K. Gupta, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General with Mr. Pranay Pratap Singh, Additional Advocate General, for respondents No. 1 & 2.

Mr. Balram Sharma, Deputy Solicitor General of India with Mr. Rajeev Sharma, Advocate, for respondent No. 3.

CWP No. 16498 of 2025 & CMP No. 16498 of 2025

Inter-alia contends that the petitioner had bid for the 125.00 meters span Arch bridge at RD 42/410 on NH 154 A (SH-125.00 meters and had claimed the experience of having constructed a bridge on river Beas, at Hanogi Khola Nala road which is stated to be 103.20 meters. The respondents however, vide communication dated 13.10.2025 (Annexure P-15) have come to the conclusion that the above experience was of 97.20 meters as per IRC-5-2015 clause 101.43. Accordingly, they have found that the requirement as such of the present bridge which was to be 80% of the longest span or 100 meters whichever is less, should be 97.90 meters and firm was found short by 0.70 meters and thus, technically non-qualified as per clause 2.2.2.2 (iii) (a). Counsel has stated that the proper span

length of the work earlier awarded should have been taken into consideration.

Notice. Mr. Pranay Pratap Singh, learned Additional Advocate General, accepts notice for respondents No. 1 & 2 and Mr. Balram Sharma, learned Deputy Solicitor General of India, accepts the same for respondent No.3.

Keeping in view the above, let the financial bid of the petitioner be also considered subject to further orders.

It is pointed out that Union of India has been wrongly arrayed as respondent through Engineer-cum-Regional Officer and it should be arrayed as respondent as Secretary. Ordered accordingly. Office to make necessary corrections.

List on **04.11.2025.**

(G.S. Sandhawalia)
Chief Justice.

(Jiya Lal Bhardwaj)
Judge

October 17, 2025
(hemlata)