



siddhi

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA
WRIT PETITION NO.431 OF 2025

C1 INDIA PRIVATE LIMITED THROUGH
MR. A. KUNDOO (AUTHORIZED
REPRESENTATIVE)

... PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF GOA THROUGH ITS CHIEF
SECRETARY AND 3 ORS.

... RESPONDENTS

Mr. Tarun Rebello, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. D. Pangam, Advocate General with Ms. Maria Simone Corriea, Additional Government Advocate for Respondent No. 1 to 3.

Mr. Gaurravvardhan Nadkarni, Advocate for the Respondent No. 4.

**CORAM:- VALMIKI MENEZES &
AMIT S. JAMSANDEKAR, JJ.**

DATED :- 28th September, 2026

P.C.

1. After hearing this Petition for some time, we are of the opinion that it would suffice if the notices dated 18.02.2025 and 15.04.2025, which are respectively at pages 241 and 251 of the Paper Book, are treated as representations before the Department of Information Technology of the Government of Goa (Respondent No. 3), who shall consider these representations and take a decision on the same within a period of four weeks from today.

2. The Petition stands disposed of on these directions.

3. We make it clear that we have not expressed any opinion on the claim of the Petitioner in this Petition and leave all contentions of the parties, including the contentions raised by the Respondents, including the objection that the claim is barred by limitation, open.

4. We also make it clear that the contentions raised by Respondent No. 4 (the alleged TPA) that they have no role to play and no relief could be sought against them by the Petitioner are kept open, and Respondent No. 4 is at liberty to agitate these objections in case the Petitioner seeks to file any proceedings, if maintainable in law.

5. The Petition stands disposed of with the aforementioned terms.

AMIT S. JAMSANDEKAR, J. VALMIKI MENEZES, J.