

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 3888/2026

M/s Naman Associates, Through Proprietor Ganesh Kumar Sharma S/o Shri Gopal Lal Sharma, Aged About 50 Years, R/o Plot No. 25, Brajraj Nagar, Near Mamta Public School, Vijayapura Road, Purani Chungi, Agra Road, Jaipur, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Nagar Nigam Lal Khoti, Jaipur Rajasthan Through Commissioner.
2. Deputy Commissioner Revenue (First), Nagar Nigam, Lal Kothi, Jaipur.

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Amin Ali with Mr. Rajeev Singh Jat
For Respondent(s)	:	

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUROOP SINGHI

Order

27/02/2026

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Amin Ali with Mr. Rajeev Singh Jat, at the very outset, submit that vide letter of acceptance dated 24.02.2025, the petitioner was awarded the contract for collection of parking charges at Johari Bazar, Jaipur, for the period of one year from 26.02.2025 to 25.02.2026.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submit that as per Clause 7 of the said tender conditions read with Clause 26, the term of the contract can be extended for one more year, for which even an application dated 10.11.2025 has been submitted by the petitioner, however, for the reasons best known to the respondents, no heed has been paid to the same till date.

3. Learned counsel have confined their prayer to the limited extent that the said application submitted by the petitioner be considered by the respondents expeditiously in accordance with law, more particularly considering the condition No.7 and 26 of the tender document.

4. Considering the limited prayer so made and without delving into the merits of the matter, the respondents are expected to decide the application submitted by the petitioner dated 10.11.2025, seeking extension of the contract, in accordance with the tender conditions expeditiously, preferably within a period of 15 days from today.

5. With the above directions, the writ petition stands disposed of.

6. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

7. Needless to say, this order has been passed only to decide the petitioner's application strictly in accordance with law and in no manner is to be construed as a direction to decide the said application in a particular manner.

(ANUROOP SINGHI),J