



1

WP-42600-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH  
AT JABALPUR

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA,  
CHIEF JUSTICE

&amp;

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VINAY SARAF

ON THE 8<sup>th</sup> OF JANUARY, 2026

WRIT PETITION No. 42600 of 2025

*M/S RELIABLE MOVERS INFINITY A REGISTERED PARTNERSHIP  
FIRM HAVING ITS PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS AT*

*Versus*

*UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS*

.....  
Appearance:

*Shri Anoop Nair - Senior Advocate with Ms. Akashmi Trivedi - Advocate for  
the appellant.*

*Shri Suyash Mohan Guru - Deputy Solicitor General with Shri Arnav Tiwari  
& Shri Dev Sharma - Advocates for the respondents*

.....  
ORDER

*Per. Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjeev Sachdeva, Chief Justice*

Petitioner is aggrieved by order dated 17.09.2025 whereby the respondents, apart from terminating the contract, have also passed an order of debarment of the petitioner for participating in any tender by Railway division for a period of two years.

2. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that insofar as the wrongful termination of the contract is concerned, since there is an alternative remedy of redressal of disputes through the process of arbitration, the petitioner does not press the said relief before this Court and reserves the right to invoke the alternative dispute redressal



mechanism for the same. Insofar as debarment is concerned, no specific show cause notice was issued to the petitioner proposing to impose the penalty of debarment prior to the impugned order being passed.

3. Learned Deputy Solicitor General appearing for the respondents states that action has been taken of termination on account of breach of the petitioner. He, however, concedes that no specific show cause notice was issued to the petitioner proposing to impose a penalty of debarment. He, however, states that as per the tender condition, debarment was a natural consequence of an order of termination. He, however, states that if liberty is granted, a specific show cause notice shall be issued prior to issuance of an order of debarment.

4. In view of above, the impugned order dated 17.09.2025 insofar as it relates to the imposition of penalty of debarment, is set aside. It is clarified that the petitioner would be at liberty to take its independent remedy in accordance with law with regard to the alleged wrongful termination. Respondents authorities shall also be liberty to initiate proceedings, if so advised, for debarment, however, said proceedings shall be initiated after issuing a proper show cause notice to the petitioner and giving an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

5. Petition is accordingly disposed of in the above terms.

(SANJEEV SACHDEVA)  
CHIEF JUSTICE

(VINAY SARAF)  
JUDGE