ITEM NO.32 COURT NO.11 SECTION XIV

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). 16610/2025

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 28-05-2025 in WP(C) No. 3207/2025 passed by the High Court of Delhi at New Delhi]

RAGHAVENDRA BAGAL Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ANR. Respondent(s)

FOR ADMISSION

Date : 26-06-2025 This petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.V. VISWANATHAN
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NONGMEIKAPAM KOTISWAR SINGH
(PARTIAL COURT WORKING DAYS BENCH)

For Petitioner(s) :
Mr. Dheeraj Malhotra, Adv.
Mr. Puneet Singh Bindra, AOR
Ms. Charu Modi, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :

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

1. We have heard Mr. Dheeraj Malhotra, learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. The short point canvassed on behalf of the petitioner is that the petitioner is a resident of Oman, but is a citizen of India holding Indian Passport. As a resident in Oman various services are availed through the consulate by the petitioner and

those who are similarly situated. The grievance of the petitioner is that under the RFP of 2014 set out (page 41 of the paper book) the maximum rate for the various types of Value Added Services were specifically set out. Bidders were obliged to specify the rates for the different types of Value Added Services. However, under the RFP was notified in February, 2025 (page 98), the bidders are obliged to quote a single service fee for all types of Consular, Passport and Visa(CPV Services).

3. To buttress the submission Mr. Malhotra draws attention to pages 222-223 of the paper book where in response to the queries raised by the bidders under serial nos. 40, 41 and 42, this aspect of single fee is reinforced.

4. Hence, the grievance is that whatever be the service the individual avails, a uniform fee is fixed irrespective of the nature of service.

5. According to Mr. Malhotra, the bidders will have no grievance on this issue and are only happy about it. His only contention is that the High Court committed an error in paragraph 8 by referring to the petition of the bidders who have challenged certain other conditions and disqualifications, to deny the petitioner, his right to mention a petition.

6. Mr. Malhotra contends that as a person holding an Indian Passport and is a resident of Oman, he has locus standi to raise the grievance and his petition to be entertained.

7. Issue notice, returnable on 25.07.2025.

8. List the matter on 25th July, 2025.

9. Let a copy of the petition be served on the learned Solicitor General.

(SONIA BHASIN)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR-CUM-PS

(SUDHIR KUMAR SHARMA)
COURT MASTER (NSH)