

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF MANIPUR
AT IMPHAL**

WP(C) No. 287 of 2026

M/S Nongmaithem Enterprises

...Petitioner/s

Vrs.

State of Manipur & 4 ors.

...Respondent/s

With

MC(WP(C)) No. 309 of 2026

- B E F O R E -

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AHANTHEM BIMOL SINGH

18.04.2026

Heard Mr. Tungrei Ngakang, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner.

[2] Issue notice, returnable within three weeks.

[3] Mr. Shyam Sharma, learned GA entered appearance on behalf of respondent Nos. 1, 2, 3 & 4 and Mr. Syed Murtaza Ahamad, learned counsel assisting Mr. N. Jotendro, learned senior counsel entered appearance and accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 5 and hence, no formal notice is called for.

[4] The present petition has been filed assailing the notification dated 02-02-2026 issued by the Office of the DC/Executive Director, DRDA, Ukhrul (DC, Ukhrul for short) by which the Technical bid submitted by the petitioner in respect of the contract work for construction of Shirui Heritage Village and Bakshi Ground at Ukhrul

District, Manipur had been notified as 'Disqualified' and also the work order dated **23-02-2026** issued by the DC, Ukhrul in favour of the respondent No. 5.

[5] Mr. Tungrei Ngakang, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the Technical bid of the petitioner has been rejected by the authorities only on the ground that the site visiting certificate, which is not a document included in the list of documents required to be uploaded online as per tender notification, was not uploaded by the petitioner. According to the learned counsel, rejection of the Technical bid submitted by the petitioner on this ground is arbitrary and illegal.

[6] The acceptance of the Technical bid submitted by the respondent No. 5 as well as the impugned work order issued in favour of the respondent No. 5, is arbitrary and illegal inasmuch as the GST clearance certificate submitted by the respondent No. 5, which according to the learned counsel is an essential document, is not a valid certificate in respect of the aforesaid contract work. On this ground, the impugned notification as well as the impugned work order issued in favour of the respondent No. 5 are liable to be quashed and set aside.

[7] Mr. Shyam Sharma, learned GA and Mr. N. Jotendro, learned senior counsel assisted by Mr. Shyed Murtaza Ahamad, learned counsel

appearing for the respondents submitted that after considering all the documents, certificates and objections filed by the bidders, the impugned notification as well as the work order has been issued and no arbitrariness or illegalities has been committed by the authorities in issuing the said impugned notification as well as the impugned work order. It has further been submitted by Mr. N. Jotendro, learned senior counsel appearing for respondent No. 5 that the said contract work is a time bound project which requires completion of the construction within a time bound manner and that the respondent No. 5 had already started execution of the work and the work is in advance stage. The learned senior counsel further submitted that any interference from this Court at this stage will affect the public interest. The learned senior counsel as well as the learned GA submitted that they may be given some time to file detail counter affidavit to decide the matter on merit.

[8] As prayed for by the learned counsel appearing for the respondents, list these cases again on 01-06-2026.

[9] The parties are directed to complete exchange of their affidavits on or before the next date of hearing without fail.

JUDGE

Dhakeshori