

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH.

2025:PHHC:117066-DB



206

CWP-24681-2025 (O&M).
Date of Decision: 29.08.2025.

Priyanka Goyal and othersPetitioners.
VERSUS
State of Punjab and othersRespondents.

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present: Ms. Monica Chhibber Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Aftab Singh Khara, Senior Deputy Advocate General,
Punjab.

Mr. Sanjeev Sharma, Advocate for respondents No.2 and 3.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (Oral)

The petitioners have challenged the action of the respondents whereby their bids with respect to SCF No.20 to 25 in the e-auction held from 15.06.2025 to 30.06.2025 have been cancelled.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners, who had bid for SCF No.20 to 25 in Sabzi Mandi, Morinda, were declared as the successful bidders with respect to SCF No.20 to 25, but the respondents did not issue the allotment letters and instead have cancelled the bids. She submits that the action of the respondents in cancelling the bids qua the aforesaid SCFs is arbitrary and ought to be set aside.

3. Learned counsel for respondents No.2 and 3 has filed short reply and while referring to the said reply, submits that the petitioners were indeed

the successful bidders having placed the highest bids for the afore-noted shops, but only a total of two bids had been received. The respondents had taken a decision that they would accept the bid only in those cases where *at least* three bids had been received. They also found that the amount, which the petitioners had paid, was only marginally higher than the reserve price and, therefore, no allotment was made in favour of any person for the shops in Sabzi Mandi, Morinda, which were put to auction in June, 2025.

4. Heard.

5. The petitioners may be the successful bidders, but the respondents appear to have taken a conscious decision that they will not accept the bid wherein less than three bidders had participated. In respect of the aforementioned SCFs, only two bidders are stated to have participated including the petitioners. The respondents had also found that the bid price was only marginally above the reserve price. This is an additional factor influencing the decision of the respondents to cancel their bids. The bids of the shops in Sabzi Mandi, Morinda had been cancelled uniformly as the bidders were less than three. We are, therefore of the considered view that there is no manifest illegality in the action of the respondents.

6. At this juncture, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the criteria of 'minimum of three bids' for acceptance of a bid, was made applicable only w.e.f. 01.08.2025 and, thus could not be made applicable retrospectively.

7. Be that as it may, the action of the respondents in not accepting the bids in those cases where less than three bids were placed, does not suffer from any arbitrariness as the objective behind the same is to ensure competitive bidding and to fetch the maximum possible price.

8. The petition, being devoid of any merit, stands dismissed.

Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

29.08.2025

jitender

Whether speaking/ reasoned : Yes/ No
Whether Reportable : Yes/ No