



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 26TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B M SHYAM PRASAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 23249 OF 2025 (GM-TEN)

BETWEEN:

M/S. RAVINDRANATH
CONSTRUCTIONS PRIVATE LIMITED
HAVING ITS OFFICE AT S-403
SOUTH WING, BRIGADE PLAZA
ANANDARAO CIRCLE,
SC ROAD,
BENGALURU - 560009

REPRESENTED BY ITS DIRECTOR,
SRI VEERENDRA PATIL R.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. B.N. MOHAN CHANDRA., ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. NAVEEN G.S., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
KARNATAKA RESIDENTIAL EDUCATIONAL
INSTITUTIONS SOCIETY (KREIS)
I FLOOR, KSCMF BUILDING,
CUNNINGHAM ROAD,
BENGALURU - 560052.





2. THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
KARNATAKA RESIDENTIAL
EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS SOCIETY (KREIS)
I FLOOR, KSCMF BUILDING,
CUNNINGHAM ROAD,
BENGALURU - 560052.
3. THE ASST. EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
KARNATAKA RESIDENTIAL
EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS
SOCIETY (KREIS)
I FLOOR, KSCMF BUILDING,
CUNNINGHAM ROAD,
BENGALURU - 56052.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. SHISHIRA AMARNATH.,ADVOCATE)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO (1) QUASH ORDER DATED 30.06.2025, BEARING NO. KAVASHISASOM / YO(1) / C.R(2) / 2025-26, PASSED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT AND PRODUCED AS ANNEXURE-E; (II) QUASH THE NOTIFICATION DATED 03.07.2025 BEARING NO.KREIS/2025-26/WORK/INDENT489/CALL-2 PASSED BY THE RESPONDENT AND PRODUCED AS ANNEXURE- H; (III) DIRECTING THE RESPONDENT NO. 1 AND 2 TO CONSIDER THE REPRESENTATION DATED 09.07.2025, PRODUCED AT ANNEXURE-F, F-1 AND F-2 TO ACCEPT THE SECURITY DEPOSIT AND COMPLY WITH OTHER



FORMALITIES TO AWARD THE CONTRACT IN FAVOUR OF THE PETITIONER WHO IS DECLARED AS L-1 ON 03.04.2025 BY TENDER ACCEPTING COMMITTEE.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR ORDERS, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:
CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B M SHYAM PRASAD

ORAL ORDER

The petitioner has successfully participated in the tender floated by the second respondent for construction of a residential school complex at Gorebal, Sindanoor Taluk, Raichur District. The petitioner has filed this petition impugning the second respondent's order dated 30.06.2025. The second respondent has cancelled the bid offered by the petitioner directing fresh tender allegedly because the petitioner has not responded to the Letter of Intent (*LOI*) in time. This Court on 19.08.2025, has observed that the outcome in the petition must turn on the following question.



Whether the petitioner has participated in the tender process being aware of the stipulation that all communications relating to the tender will be only on the e-portal and the petitioner's response must also be in the light of the details uploaded on the e-portal.

2. Further, this Court, taking on record the petitioner's grievance as canvassed by Sri Naveen G S, its learned counsel, to substantiate the petitioner's case that neither the LOI nor the Letter of Acceptance [LOA] was visible to the petitioner on the Portal, has called upon the Principal Secretary, Department of Social Welfare, Government of Karnataka, to hear the petitioner and the second respondent's representative and file a report on the method that is followed by the respondents.

3. The Principal Secretary has filed a detailed report as required by this Court's order, and the



Principal Secretary's finding on the LOI/LOA and its visibility on the portal, reads as under :

"FINDINGS ON LOI UPLOAD AND VISIBILITY

Based on information provided by the project director, E-Procurement cell, portal logs and screenshots:

- a. The LOI was uploaded on 29.05.2025 at 19:51:36, accessible via the petitioner's credentials under "My LOI" until 19.06.2025, with logs showing "Sent to Bidder" status.*
- b. Post-revocation on 30.06.2025, the LOI status changed to "LOI Revoked" and was archived from the bidder's dashboard to avoid confusion, but historical logs [accessible to the Tender Inviting Authority] confirm the upload. The petitioner's screenshots reflect the post-revocation view.*
- c. No technical glitches or selective access were found; the portal ensures real-time bidder access and non-monitoring by the petitioner, as per the Government Order dated 01.08.2018.*



However, upon detailed examination, it is observed that the tender portal demonstrates substantial opaqueness towards bidders. Despite technical compliance, the portal's interface and functionality have resulted in confusion and limited access to key communications such as LOA visibility. It is therefore found that the tender portal requires significant improvement to enhance transparency and fairness in the bidding process.

4. The Principal Secretary, has also answered the question on *whether the Portal, as accessible to the petitioner through its credentials, shows that the LOA was issued to the petitioner, and the Principal Secretary has opined thus.*

Though the software creators [E procurement] claimed that LOI was visible from 29.05.2025 to 30.06.2025, they could not provide any evidence for the same. Thus the software does not appear to be fool proof in the sense there is no instructions to the bidder either via SMS/WhatsApp/E-mail notifying him of the issuance of LOI. This means, the bidder is kept



in dark, with regard to issuance of LOI, unless the bidder has to login to the portal every day. This gives scope for manipulation in the procurement. Also, the software people could not prove or submit a log sheet to substantiate their claims.

This Court, in the light of the factual inquiry and the report, is persuaded to opine that the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for interference with the second respondent's impugned order and there must be just orders. Hence, the following.

ORDER

[A] The petition is allowed quashing the second respondent's order dated 30.06.2025 and the subsequent Notification dated 03.07.2025.

[B] The petitioner is reserved with liberty file a certified copy of this order with the second respondent within a week from the date



of receipt thereof and the second respondent is called upon to cause communication [through Registered Post Acknowledgement Due] extending an opportunity to the petitioner to execute the documents as required in terms of the LOI dated 29.05.2025.

- [C]** If the petitioner executes the documents and complies with all other requirements within the timelines as indicated in the Communication which shall be in accord with the tender notification, the second respondent shall issue the requisite work order to the petitioner.

Sd/-
(B M SHYAM PRASAD)
JUDGE