



IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH  
AT JABALPUR

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA,

CHIEF JUSTICE

&

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VINAY SARAF

ON THE 19<sup>th</sup> OF DECEMBER, 2025

WRIT PETITION No. 49357 of 2025

*M/S ARJUN SINGH CONTRACTOR AND SUPPLIER*

*Versus*

*THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS*

---

Appearance:

Shri Kailash Chandra Ghildiyal - Senior Advocate with Shri Nitya Nand Mishra - Advocate for the petitioner.

Dr. S.S. Chouhan - Government Advocate for respondent/State.

---

ORDER

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

Petitioner impugns communication dated 28.11.2025, whereby the respondent no.4, Executive Engineer, PWD has decided to rescind the earlier tender and rejected the bid of the petitioner and also to invite the fresh bid.

Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submits that the decision has been taken on the ground that petitioner has failed to produce the original documents.

Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submits that a complaint was received in respect of copies of the documents uploaded by the petitioner along with his E-bid and petitioner was called upon to produce the original



documents. He submits that petitioner was ill advised and accordingly took shelter behind certain statutory provisions contending that petitioner could not be forced to produce the original documents, when certain statutory compliance have already been made. He submits that petitioner has all the documents, however, was not advised to produce the same. He, however, seeks leave to withdraw the petition reserving the rights of the petitioner to participate in the subsequent tender.

In view of the above, petition is dismissed as withdrawn. Keeping in view the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, petitioner would be permitted to participate in the subsequent tenders that have been invited by communications dated 08.12.2025 and 12.12.2025.

The petition is accordingly dismissed as withdrawn in the aforesaid terms.

All rights and contentions of the parties are reserved.

It would further be open to the petitioner to defend the proceedings, if any, initiated with regard to the forfeiture of earnest money deposit and/or blacklisted.

(SANJEEV SACHDEVA)  
CHIEF JUSTICE

(VINAY SARAF)  
JUDGE

rk.