



Serial No. 03
Regular List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

WP(C) No. 564 of 2025

Date of Decision :18.03.2026

Manaksia Aluminium Company Limited
Represented by Mr. Anand Kumar Chaudhary,
8/1, Lal Bazar Street, Bikaner Building,
Third Floor, Kolkata, West Bengal-700001

...Petitioner(s)

-Versus-

1. The State of Meghalaya represented by
The Chief Secretary to the Government of
Meghalaya, Shillong.
2. The Secretary to the Government of Meghalaya,
Housing Department, Government of Meghalaya,
Shillong.
3. The Director,
Directorate of Housing, Government of Meghalaya,
Shillong-793001.
4. M/s Power Roofing, Umtru Road
Village Amjok, Byrnihat, Ri-Bhoi District,
Meghalaya-793122
5. M/s Meghalaya Roofing, Industrial Area,
Umiam, Meghalaya-793103.
6. M/s Mariem Commerce Limited, Umbir,
Ri-Bhoi District, Meghalaya-793101.

...Respondent(s)



Coram:

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

Appearance:

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. Philemon Nongbri, Adv.

For the Respondent(s) : Mr. N.D. Chullai, AAG with
Ms. Z.E Nongkynrih, GA (For R 1-3)
Dr. N. Mozika, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. M.L. Nongpiur, Adv. (For R 4)

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. The writ petitioner by way of this writ petition has put a challenge to order dated 07.09.2025, whereby the Departmental Tender Committee has rejected the technical bid of the petitioner, for consideration for supply of roofing sheets to the respondents. The petitioner was an original tenderer which was initiated by an NIQ dated 10.09.2024, and on not being successful had challenged the same by way of WP(C) No. 478 of 2024, wherein the entire tender process was set aside. On appeal therefrom, the learned Division Bench by order dated 28.08.2025, had then directed that the eligibility of the petitioner company and the respondent No. 6 (M/s Mariem Commerce Limited), be considered afresh.



2. Thereafter, the writ petitioner as per the directions of this Court was heard by the respondents and the petitioner's technical bid was then rejected, which has prompted the instant writ petition. However, as the respondent No. 4, (Power Roofing) was already found eligible as also respondent No. 5 (M/s Meghalaya Roofing), the respondents allocated 75% of the supply order to the respondent No. 4, with the remaining 25% however, being kept on hold due to the fact that the respondent No. 5 had withdrawn the EMD. These facts as stated find place in a collateral proceeding namely; in WP(C) No. 570 of 2025 instituted by the respondent No. 5, which was disposed of by this Court by order 25.02.2026, wherein for the remaining 25%, directions had been issued for a fresh call to be taken by the Departmental Tender Committee on the facts as they stand.

3. As such, in view of the circumstances aforementioned, the writ petition has been rendered infructuous and is accordingly closed and disposed of.

JUDGE

Meghalaya
18.03.2026
"V. Lyndem- PS"