



Serial No.02
Supp. List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

WP(C). No. 230 of 2026

Date of Decision: 01.06.2026

M/s. Perfect Stamping Pvt. Ltd.
A Company incorporated under Company's Act
Having its Registered office at Plot No. 97 & 98,
Revenue Sr. No. Golden Industrial Area,
Near Shaper Village, Virvar Road, Rajkot Gujrat-360025,
Represented by its authorised representative
Shri. Amit Mehta.

...Petitioner

-Versus-

1. Union of India, represented by the Secretary,
Ministry of Home Affairs, North Block,
New Delhi-110001.
2. The Director General Assam Rifles,
Headquarter DGAR, Shillong, Meghalaya.
3. The Procurement Officer, Headquarter DGAR,
Shillong Meghalaya – 793011.

...Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice H.S.Thangkhiew, Judge

Appearance:

For the Petitioner/Applicant(s) : Mr. P.Ghosh, Adv.
Mr.N.Upadhyay, Adv.

For the Respondent(s) : Dr. N.Mozika, DSGI with
Ms. C.Jala, Adv.



- | | | |
|-----|---|--------|
| i) | Whether approved for reporting in Law journals etc: | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether approved for publication in press: | Yes/No |
-

JUDGMENT AND ORDER (ORAL)

1. Heard Mr. P.Ghosh, learned counsel for the petitioner.
2. Issue notice.
3. Dr. N.Mozika, learned DSGI assisted by Ms. C.Jala, learned counsel is present on behalf of all the respondents, as such, no further notice is required.
4. The grievance of the writ petitioner is that his bid for supply of kitchen utensils was rejected without any reasons being ascribed. Mr. P.Ghosh, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that all the requirements as stipulated in the tender documents have been complied with and as such, the disqualification of the writ petitioner is without any basis. He therefore, prays for some interim protection at this stage.
5. At the outset, Dr. N.Mozika, learned DSGI for the respondents has raised a preliminary objection with regard to the sustainability of the writ petition on account of the fact that the writ petitioner, by a single writ petition has put a challenge to three separate bids which are different causes of action. He submits on this ground alone, the writ petition deserves no consideration. Learned DSGI has also produced a set of instructions dated



29-05-2026, wherein the reasons for rejection of the bids of the petitioner have been indicated. He further submits that the writ petitioner was also afforded an opportunity to rectify and clarify the deficiencies within 48 hours window, which however, was not availed of by the writ petitioner, and as such, the petitioner is not entitled to any relief at this stage.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties, firstly, on the preliminary objection raised by the learned DSGI, it is noted that in the document of the writ petitioner itself, at page 13, four separate bids have been mentioned, on which three have been tendered by the writ petitioner. Prima facie it appears that the bids being separate and the reasons for rejection also being different, a single writ petition will not be able to sustain the grievances of the writ petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed, however, with liberty to the writ petitioner to file afresh, if so advised.

Judge