

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT
JODHPUR**

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9850/2026

Lord Krishna Enterprises, Having Its Office At 1St Floor, 89B, New Grain Market, Hanumangarh Town, Hanumangarh, Rajasthan, Through Its Proprietor Seema Hissaria, Daughter Of Shri Phoosa Ram Khadrria, Aged About 50 Years, Residing At 1St Floor, 89B, New Grain Market, Hanumangarh Town, Hanumangarh, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Registrar, Co-Operative Societies, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. Administrator, Rajasthan State Co-Operative Marketing Federation Ltd., Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan.
3. Deputy Registrar, Co-Operative Societies, District Sri Ganganagar.
4. District Collector, Sri Ganganagar.
5. Zonal Officer, Rajasthan State Co-Operative Marketing Federation Ltd, Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan.
6. Chief Manager, Kray Vikray Sahkari Samiti, Ridmalsar, Sriganganagar.
7. M/s Ayush Traders, Through Its Proprietor Dharm Pal, Son Of Banwari Lal, Aged 33 Year, Resident Of 16, Near Ambedkar Park, Kishanpura, Mithanpura, Sirsa, Haryana.

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Harshit Bhurani.

For Respondent(s) :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MUKESH RAJPUROHIT

Order

06/05/2026

1. It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that, pursuant to publication of the NIB for e-bid by the respondents, the petitioner was declared qualified for transportation and handling of crops purchased at MSP vide order dated 02.04.2026 (Annexure-5). Pursuant thereto, the petitioner was evaluated, the

technical bid of the private respondent was rejected, and subsequently, the work order was issued in favour of the petitioner. It is submitted that the petitioner has already commenced the procurement work. It is further contended that the said action was challenged by respondent No.7, who is one of the competitors in the tender process, by filing a writ petition bearing No.8464/2026, which is pending consideration before this Court. The petitioner has appeared as a caveator in the said writ petition and no interim order in favour of respondent No.7 has been granted therein till date. However, concealing this material fact, respondent No.7 preferred an appeal before first appellate authority in respect of the same controversy without impleading the petitioner.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that vide impugned order dated 21.04.2026, the appellate authority, without issuance of notice and without affording any opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, has allowed the appeal and cancelled the tender process, despite having no authority to do so.

3. The matter requires consideration.

4. Issue notice, returnable within a period of six weeks.

5. In the meanwhile, and till the next date of hearing, the effect and operation of the impugned order dated 21.04.2026 (Annex.9) and communication dated 30.04.2026 shall remain stayed.

(MUKESH RAJPUROHIT),J