

ITEM NO.26

COURT NO.14

SECTION XII-A

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

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CIVIL) Diary No(s). 40871/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 10-07-2026 in WA No. 832/2026 passed by the High Court of Andhra Pradesh at Amravati]

M/S. CORPUS ENTERPRISES PRIVATE LIMITED

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH & ANR.

Respondent(s)

IA No. 196594/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

IA No. 196593/2026 - PERMISSION TO FILE SLP WITHOUT CERTIFIED/PLAIN COPY OF IMPUGNED ORDER

Date : 17-07-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.V. VISWANATHAN
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

For Petitioner(s) :Mr. C Kranthi Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Danish Saifi, Adv.
Mr. Shafik Ahmed, Adv.
Ms. Abida, Adv.
Mr. S Subramaniam, Adv.
Mr. Vv Kk Hanumanth Prasad, Adv.
Mr. Abdul Gaffar, Adv.
Mr. Rashid N. Azam, AOR

For Respondent(s) :Mr. Byrapaneni Suyodhan, Adv.
Ms. Obulapuram Keerthi, Adv.
Ms. Esha Thawal, Adv.
Ms. Tatini Basu, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

1. Heard Mr. C. Kranthi Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner

and Mr. Byrapaneni Suyodhan, learned counsel for the respondent No.2

2. The present Special Leave Petition calls in question the correctness of the order dated 10.07.2026 in Writ Appeal No. 832 of 2026. The said writ petition was filed assailing the order dated 30.06.2026, passed in I.A No. 1 of 2026 in Writ Petition No. 15339 of 2026.

3. By the said order, the learned Single Judge declined to grant an interim order of stay of the proceedings arising out of the impugned Request for Proposal(RFP) bearing -Ref. No.-APSFL/MW-DRM SW/2026 dated 21.05.2026 issued by the Respondent No.2/APSFL, and further refused the prayer of the petitioner for extension of time for submission of its bid/proposal and made the process subject to the result of the writ petition.

4. We are not setting out the facts in detail, lest it prejudice either parties at the final hearing of this Writ Petition. The petitioner's grievance is that the tender is issued when his contract for the same work is subsisting and also that in the new RFP, a clause has been inserted, seeking a declaration that the bidders have no show cause notices issued against them.

5. According to the petitioner, with regard to the execution of work with the respondent No.2, there are two show cause notices and in the teeth of those show cause notices, he is not able to give the declaration and as such he is not able to participate in the bid. It is also his case that the tender itself was for a project which the petitioner is in the process of executing on account of an award given to him earlier.

6. Mr. Suyodhan, learned counsel for the State disputes each of

the said contentions. According to him, the petitioner was at fault and did not carry out the work entrusted to him and considering the nature of the work, the Authority cannot be foreclosed from issuing fresh tender. These and other matters have to be adjudicated in the main Writ Petition.

7. The main Writ Petition is posted on 21.07.2026. We are of opinion that till the main Writ Petition is heard and decided, no further steps should be taken in the request for proposal (RFP) read with the corrigendum which has been impugned in the present Writ Petition. The High Court shall make an endeavour to hear the Writ Petition itself on 21.07.2026 or on such earlier date that the High Court may deem fit to notify the matter.

8. With the aforesaid observations, this Special Leave Petition is disposed of.

(SACHIN KUMAR SRIVASTAVA)
COURT MASTER (SH)

(MANOJ KUMAR)
COURT MASTER (NSH)