

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**CIVIL APPEAL NOS.                      OF 2025  
(Arising out of SLP(C) Nos.13716-13717/2020)**

**OMEGA ELEVATORS**

**APPELLANT**

**VERSUS**

**STATE OF M.P. & ANR.**

**RESPONDENTS**

**O R D E R**

**1.     Leave granted.**

**2.     The appellant-Company before us is aggrieved by the judgment dated 20.03.2020, passed by the High Court of Madhya Pradesh at Gwalior as well as the order dated 12.10.2020, whereby their Review Petition was also declined. These dual orders thus form the subject-matter of challenge in these appeals.**

**3.     We may briefly advert to the facts of the instant case, before making any observation on merits. The Gwalior Municipal Corporation (in short, the "GMC") issued a Notice Inviting Tender (in short, the "NIT") on 17.12.2019: inviting certain permitted bidders to submit their bid(s) for the work of supply, installation, testing, commissioning, and**

maintenance of lifts, including allied works under the Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana at Mahal Gaon Ki Pahadi and Manpur, Gwalior, Madhya Pradesh. Notably, the work was required to be completed within six months, and the value of the tender was approximately Rs. 1460.60 lakhs.

4. The appellant-Company firstly submitted a representation to the GMC to partake in the aforementioned NIT. When it failed to receive any response therefrom, it submitted its bid online, on 10.01.2020.

5. At this juncture, it is apposite to point out that the reason why the appellant was not permitted to participate in the NIT or submit bids towards securing the tender was that the GMC had annexed a list of 10 companies to the NIT, who alone would be eligible and permitted to submit bids for the particular contract. Statedly, these companies were considered to be the 10 most reputed firms in the business of manufacturing lifts/elevators and were accordingly selected by the GMC to ensure quality services.

6. The aggrieved appellant eventually approached the High Court, but its writ petition has been

dismissed, primarily on the strength of a decision of this Court in Global Energy Ltd. and another vs. Adani Exports Ltd. and others, (2005) 4 SCC 435. Needless to say, the ruling in *Global Energy (supra)* chiefly held that the terms of a tender notice by a statutory authority must not be generally interfered with, unless wholly arbitrary, discriminatory, or actuated by malice.

7. As noticed earlier, the lift installation work was to be executed within six months, and since no *interim* stay was granted either by the High Court or by this Court, it is not in dispute that the work has since been completed by the successful bidder, who, incidentally, has not been arrayed as one of the respondents. No effective relief, therefore, can be granted to the appellant.

8. The short question, however, that survives for consideration is whether the GMC's decision to restrict the bidding process to only 10 companies—and thereby exclude all other potential bidders—can be justified in light of the precedent cited above, and whether the High Court correctly applied the *ratio decidendi* of that decision.

9. We have heard learned Counsel for the parties,

and minutely perused the record.

10. The legal principle that the terms of a public tender notice are not generally open to judicial scrutiny and interference, unless found to be *per se* arbitrary—is well known. It is trite law that judicial review would apply to the exercise of contractual powers by the Government, to the limited extent of preventing arbitrariness or favouritism.<sup>1</sup> Of course, what constitutes an arbitrary action is ultimately to be answered in the facts and circumstances of any given case.<sup>2</sup>

11. We have already set out the factual backdrop of these appeals hereinabove. It appears to us that the assertion that an open tender would render the allotment process cumbersome and time-consuming, or the claim that permitting bidders beyond the designated 10 would result in the installation of inferior quality lifts, is seemingly conjectural – and a mere presumption based on surmises.

12. Admittedly, all 10 companies flagged by the GMC as eligible in the NIT are multi-national corporations, and are all based outside India. This fact clearly indicates that the GMC ostensibly

1 Tata Cellular v. Union of India, (1994) 6 SCC 651.

2 Union of India v. International Trading Co., (2003) 5 SCC 437.

believes that a company's status as a global entity *ipso facto* confers on it the requisite repute and expertise necessary to undertake the specified works. In our considered opinion, it is wholly untenable to argue that Indian manufacturers (such as the present appellant) are inherently incapable of competing with international products, or that any service tendered by them would be of an inferior nature. We, in no uncertain terms, disapprove of such presumptive practices. Save and except in a case where the competent authority, after following an objective analysis by an expert team, arrives at a well-reasoned, non-discriminatory, and scientifically supported conclusion. No such argument or supporting material was submitted by the GMC before the High Court or before us. We further believe that there are several other remedial measures which could have been taken by the GMC, including the prescription of stricter standards and criteria in the NIT, to ensure that there is no compromise with the quality or post-installation services.

13. That being so, while we dispose of these appeals as infructuous, we caution and expect the GMC to act in a more transparent manner keeping the observations made hereinabove in the future. The

impugned judgment and orders of the High Court stand modified/explained to the extent above.

14. The appeals are disposed of in the above terms.

.....J.  
(SURYA KANT)

.....J.  
(NONGMEIKAPAM KOTISWAR SINGH)

New Delhi;  
February 04, 2025

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s).13716-13717/2020

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 20-03-2020 in WP No.1358/2020, 12-10-2020 in RP No.544/2020 passed by the High Court of Madhya Pradesh at Gwalior]

OMEGA ELEVATORS

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF M.P. & ANR.

Respondent(s)

(IA No.118356/2020 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

Date : 04-02-2025 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA KANT  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NONGMEIKAPAM KOTISWAR SINGH

For Petitioner(s) :Mr. Bhargav Hasurkar, Adv.  
Ms. Jesal Wahi, AOR  
Mr. Kabir Hathi, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :Mr. Sandeep Singh, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E R

1. Leave granted.
2. The appeals are disposed of in terms of the signed order.
3. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(ARJUN BISHT)  
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(PREETHI T.C.)  
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

(signed order is placed on the file)