Sr. No. 144

HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH
AT JAMMU

WP (C) No. 3129/2026

Date of pronouncement: 30.09.2026
Date of uploading: 30.09.2026

Naseem Akhter, age 42 years …..Petitioner(s)
W/o Mohd. Younis,
R/o Village Rani Badetar, Tehsil
Nowshera, District Rajouri-185151.

Through: Mr. Mohd. Asif, Advocate

Vs

1. UT of J&K through its ….. Respondent(s)
Commissioner/Secretary, Rural Development and Panchayati Raj Development, Civil Secretariat, Jammu-180001.

2. The Director, Rural Development Department, Gramin Vikas Bhawan, Talab Tillo, Jammu, J&K-180016.

3. The Superintending Engineer, REW, Vikas Bawan, Talab Tillo, Jammu, J&K-180002.

4. The Executive Engineer, REW Division, Rajouri-185131.

Through:

HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH
सत्यमेव जयते

Coram: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHAHZAD AZEEM, JUDGE

ORDER (ORAL)
30.09.2026

1. Petitioner is seeking quashing of the technical evaluation undertaken in pursuance of Tender No. e-NIT 82 REW Rajouri of 2026 dated 27.08.2026, whereby the petitioner was disqualified.

2. The principal ground urged by the petitioner is that, despite being a resident of the concerned Panchayat and eligible to participate in the tender floated

by the respondents, her residential status was ignored and she was disqualified.

3. It appears that the respondents have floated the tender, *inter alia*, for construction of a toilet complex. There was a requirement that bidder should be a resident of concerned Panchayat, where amount of construction of the toilet is up to Rs. 3 lacs. In the case on hand, the construction work was to be undertaken in Panchayat Doongi, whereas the petitioner is a resident of Panchayat Chingus. This led to rejection of her claim. There is nothing on record to show that petitioner belongs to Panchayat Doongi and, therefore, her candidature was not considered. Thus, it appears that the petitioner did not fulfill the requirement of residence in terms of tender document, which resulted in rejection of her candidature.

4. In this view of the matter, no illegality is found to have been committed by the respondents in not accepting the bid of the petitioner as the same was found deficient as per the conditions of the NIT.

5. Accordingly, the petition is found to be misconceived and is, accordingly, ***dismissed***.

(Shahzad Azeem)
Judge

Jammu
30.09.2026
Mihul

Whether the order is reportable? Yes/No
Whether the order is speaking? Yes/No