
(2025) 04 UK CK 0889

In the Uttarakhand High Court

Case No : Writ Petition (M/B) No. 184 Of 2025

Media 24x7 Advertising Pvt. Ltd.

APPELLANT

Vs

Nagar Nigam, Roorkee, District Haridwar And Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 29-04-2025

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2025) 04 UK CK 0889

Hon'ble Judges : Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J; Ashish Naithani, J

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : Shobhit Saharia, Sagar Kothari, Lalit Miglani

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J

1. Petitioner was granted advertising rights through competitive bidding by Nagar Nigam, Roorkee for a period of two years, vide order dated 26.07.2024.
2. As per the said order, petitioner was permitted to advertise through hoarding/ billboards on 78 unipoles within territorial limits of Nagar Nigam, Roorkee.
3. In this writ petition, petitioner has challenged another tender process initiated by Nagar Nigam vide publication dated 17.08.2024, whereby, expression of interest was invited for installation, maintenance and running of traffic signal lights (2 way, 4 way and Blinker) at seven locations within Nagar Nigam, Roorkee on Public Private Partnership mode.
4. It is contended that, in lieu of setting up the traffic lights, Nagar Nigam has permitted the bidder, who has been selected for setting up the traffic signal lights to put up advertisement on seven unipoles in the middle or side of the road. This, according to the petitioner, is unjust and illegal, as advertising rights were given to the petitioner for two years, and his interest would be adversely affected, if others are also permitted to put unipoles for advertising.

5. Per contra, Mr. Lalit Miglani, learned counsel for Nagar Nigam submits that monopoly was not created in favour of petitioner and vide order dated 26.07.2024 petitioner was given right to display advertisement on 78 unipoles only, therefore, the Nagar Nigam was well within its right to permit the successful bidder to install traffic signal lights, and in lieu of such installation, permit the successful bidder to put up unipoles on 7 locations.

6. This Court finds substance in the submission made by Mr. Lalit Miglani, Advocate.

7. Since, no monopoly was created in favour of the petitioner, regarding advertising rights and he was given permission to erect unipoles on 78 locations within Nagar Nigam, Roorkee, therefore, the challenge thrown by the petitioner to the tender process initiated by Nagar Nigam, Roorkee, for erection of the traffic signal lights, is without any substance. The ground taken for challenging the acceptance letter dated 03.09.2024, are also not sustainable. Even otherwise also, petitioner do not have the locus standi to raise the issues, which he has raised for questing the process of selection adopted by Nagar Nigam for installation of traffic lights.

8. The Writ Petition thus fails, and is, hereby, dismissed.