



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 19th OF DECEMBER, 2025

WRIT PETITION No. 49806 of 2025

*M/S L.N. MALVIYA INFRA PROJECTS PVT. LTD. AND KALYAN
TOLL INFRASTRUCTURE LTD. JV*

Versus

MADHYA PRADESH JAL NIGAM MARYADIT AND OTHERS

Appearance:

*Shri Naman Nagrath - Senior Advocate with Shri Jubin Prasad -
Advocate for Petitioner.*

*Shri Siddharth Sharma - Advocate (through VC) with Shri Shubham
Manchani - Advocate for Caveat.*

ORDER

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

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the respondents have contrary to the terms and conditions of the contract terminated the same and also threatened an action of blacklisting and forfeiture of bank guarantee against the petitioner. He submits that an appeal has already been filed on 16.12.2025 with a reiteration on 17.12.2025 and the same has not been decided till date.

Since petitioner has already invoked the alternative dispute resolution mechanism and filed an appeal, we propose to dispose of this petition with



the direction to respondents to decide the appeal of the petitioner in accordance with law after giving an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

Learned counsel appearing for the respondents submits that he has no concrete instruction whether the appeal has been disposed of or still pending.

Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submits that no communication has been received by the petitioner with regard to hearing of the appeal and he has not been heard till today.

Be that as it may, in case, the appeal has not been decided, the same shall be decided within a period of two weeks after giving an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner. In case, the appeal has already been decided, the order be communicated to the petitioner within two days.

It would be open to the petitioner to avail of such further remedy as may be permissible in law in case, petitioner is aggrieved by the decision on the appeal.

It is clarified that this Court has neither considered nor commented on the merits of the contention of the either party.

(SANJEEV SACHDEVA)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(VINAY SARAF)
JUDGE

Shub