



2026:DHC:8286



\$~81

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

% ***Date of Decision: September 23rd, 2026***

CNR No. DLHC010455752026

+ **W.P.(C) 14031/2026 & CM APPL. 65651/2026**

M/S SAI CONSTRUCTIONSPetitioner

Through: **Ms. Shruti Kapur, Mr. Modassin
H. Khan and Mr. Manoj K.
Singh, Advocates.**

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.Respondents

Through: **Mr. Ruchir Mishra, Mr. Sanjiv
Kumar Saxena, Ms. Reba Jena
Mishra, Mr. Mukesh Kumar
Tiwari and Ms. Poonam
Shukla, Advocates. Mr. Govil
Upadhyay, GP.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

AMIT MAHAJAN, J. (Oral)

1. By the present petition, the petitioner challenges the order dated 03.05.2026 (hereafter '**impugned order**') passed by the respondent authorities pursuant to which the petitioner's application for renewal of enlistment and the representations preferred by the petitioner were rejected.

2. Succinctly stated, the petitioner was listed as a Class 'C' contractor with the respondents for military engineering services *vide*



2026:DHC:8286



letter dated 05.05.2010 with validity of enlistment till 31.12.2015. Thereafter, for the subsequent cycle, the petitioner applied for renewal of enlistment and the validity of the enlistment was renewed till 31.12.2020.

3. It is the case of the petitioner that thereafter, owing to the grave and unavoidable medical circumstances suffered by the partner managing the firm, under the renewal policy dated 24.04.2020 for the cyclic period between 2021-2025, the petitioner's renewal application was delayed. Consequently, a show cause notice dated 19.08.2021 was issued by the respondent authorities and the petitioner was asked to show cause as to why the petitioner should not be removed from the approved list of contractors. It is the petitioner's case that it had submitted a comprehensive reply *vide* its letter dated 28.08.2021 explaining the reason for the delay.

4. The petitioner's renewal was however rejected *vide* letter dated 08.02.2022. Aggrieved by the same, a departmental appeal was preferred by the petitioner. Since no decision was taken on the appeal, a writ petition being W.P.(C)No.18834/2025 was filed by the petitioner before this Court. By order dated 11.12.2025, this Court directed the appellate authority to expeditiously dispose of the petitioner's appeal. Pursuant to the same, *vide* order dated 12.01.2026, the respondent authorities dismissed the petitioner's appeal noting that the petitioner had not secured any MES/government work during the cyclic period 2016-2020.

5. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner filed another writ petition



2026:DHC:8286



before this Court being W.P.(C) 2012/2026 challenging the order dated 12.01.2026 passed by the respondent authorities. This Court *vide* order dated 17.02.2026, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, directed the appellate authority to reconsider its decision in light of the submissions made by the petitioner.

6. In the aftermath of the aforesaid proceedings, the impugned order was passed whereby the petitioner's representations were rejected and its prayer for renewal of enlistment was also dismissed by the respondent authorities.

7. It is in this backdrop that the petitioner has preferred the present petition thereby challenging the impugned order.

8. The limited grievance expressed by the petitioner before this Court in the present case is that the respondent authorities have failed to provide any reason for non-renewal and have merely rejected the petitioner's representations by a non-speaking order. The petitioner has further sought to impress upon this Court that the delay in submitting the renewal application was attributable to the ill health of the partner managing the affairs of the partnership firm and consequently prays that the impugned order be set aside.

9. On the other hand, the respondents have voraciously argued that the petitioner themselves delayed the submission of application for renewal in a timely manner. It has further been argued that the impugned order is well reasoned and does not warrant any interference by this Court in exercise of jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.



2026:DHC:8286



10. The limited grievance thus presented before this Court for adjudication is that the appeal preferred by the petitioner was summarily and arbitrarily rejected by the respondent authorities without providing any reasons for non-renewal of the petitioner's enlistment.

11. Having taken note of the said contentions, this Court is unimpressed by the arguments agitated by the petitioner. A perusal of the impugned order indicates that the respondent authorities have considered the stance of the petitioner, and, by way of a detailed order, the appeal of the petitioner was dismissed. In doing so, the impugned order records that the process for renewal of enlistment for further five years, that is, up to 31.12.2025, started after 24.04.2020 with the last date for application being 31.07.2020. The impugned order records that in view of the COVID-19 pandemic, the deadline was extended from time to time, and was finally extended up to 31.03.2021.

12. The impugned order further records that in the meantime various emails were sent to the petitioner about the extension of the last date for application despite which no renewal application was preferred by the petitioner. The respondent authorities further took into account the reason furnished by the petitioner for not preferring the renewal application being the ill health of the partner managing the affairs of the firm and noted that the petitioner's partnership firm comprised four partners and illness of one partner did not suffice to explain the delay caused in preferring the application for renewal.



2026:DHC:8286



13. From a perusal of the impugned order, it is apparent that the respondent authorities duly considered the contentions of the petitioners. Due application of mind is discernible from brief reasoning as well and, in any event, adequacy of the reasoning given by the respondent authorities, cannot be ventured into in writ jurisdiction.

14. This Court has, however, taken note of the reasons given by the respondent authorities for non-renewal of the petitioner's enlistment. While the petitioner provided its reasons for the delay in preferring the renewal application, the respondent authorities, while passing the impugned order, noted that the initial deadline for submission of non-renewal application was 31.07.2020. As noted in the impugned order, the said deadline was extended as many as three times and lastly up to 31.03.2021. Despite the same, the petitioner only submitted its non-renewal application on 28.08.2021, that too, after the show cause notice was issued on 19.08.2021.

15. In view of the foregoing discussion, this Court does not find any perversity in the impugned order. The findings recorded by the respondent authorities are based on a reasoned appreciation of evidence on record and do not warrant any interference in exercise of jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

16. Insofar as any grievance pertaining to fresh enlistment is concerned, the impugned order duly records that non renewal did not tantamount to blacklisting and there existed no embargo for fresh enlistment.



2026:DHC:8286



17. The present petition is accordingly dismissed. Pending application also stands disposed of.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

SEPTEMBER 23, 2026

DV