



**Appeal No. PPRA/AP-07/2025**  
Government of Pakistan  
**Public Procurement Regulatory Authority**  
**(Appeal & Review Petition Secretariat)**  
1<sup>st</sup> Floor, FBC Building, G-5/2, Islamabad  
◇◇◇◇

**ORDER**

M/s Office Automation Group (OAG)

**...the "Appellant"**

Vs.

Lahore Electric Supply Company (LESCO), etc.

**...the "Respondent(s)"**

<b>Date of Hearing</b>	<i>Mr. Ghulam Mustafa Sindho, Mr. Arslan Butt</i>
<b>17.04.2025</b>	<b>(On behalf of the Appellant)</b>
	<i>Barrister Qasim Duggal, Mr. Amir Fazal, Mr. Ghulam Muhammad</i>
	<b>(On behalf of the Respondent)</b>

**APPEAL UNDER RULE 48(7) OF THE PUBLIC PROCUREMENT RULES, 2004**

The above-mentioned learned counsel and representative(s) of the parties tendered appearance before the Appellate Committee.

2. The representative of the Appellant i.e., M/s Office Automation Group (OAG) submitted that they filed an appeal against Respondent No. 01 (LESCO) for the floated tender No.4073 for procurement of photocopiers, which was opened

on 26.09.2024. As per stance of the representative of the appellant they submitted their bid in strict compliance with tender requirements and was declared as lowest financially evaluated bidder. Despite being the lowest bidder, the Appellant was arbitrarily disqualified by the Technical Committee on the pretext that the quoted photocopier model did not meet the newly introduced conditions, requiring the model to be not more than five years old. Further as per the appellant's stance, this disqualification is unjustified, arbitrary and contrary to the Public Procurement Rules, 2004 (PP Rules, 2004), and ignores the clarifications officially provided by Konica Minolta, the Appellant's principal manufacturer, certifying that the quoted Bizhub 367 model is current and upgraded in 2022.

3. Further, the representative of the appellant submitted that, it is pertinent to highlight that after bid opening, the Technical Committee sought clarifications through letter dated 09.10.2024 and dated 28.10.2024, to which the Appellant submitted detailed and satisfactory responses, including an official confirmation letter from Konica Minolta confirming compliance with specifications and up-gradation status. Despite these factual clarifications, the Technical Committee issued an Evaluation Report dated 04.12.2024, disqualifying the Appellant without proper justification. Resultantly, the Appellant filed a formal



*[Handwritten signature]*

*[Handwritten signature]*

grievance petition dated 11.12.2024, which was subsequently rejected without lawful justification ignoring the documentary evidence submitted including the confirmation letters of the manufacturer. Hence, being aggrieved, filed the instant Appeal.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel of the respondent (LESCO) denied all the assertion made by the representative of the appellant.

5. At the first instance, learned counsel of the respondent (LESCO) submitted his Power of Attorney and written reply on behalf of the respondent. Before entering into detailed arguments, the Appellate Committee inquired from the counsel of the respondent about the current status of the instant procurement process called in question. Upon this, the counsel of the respondent referred to a letter / memo dated 11.04.2025 of LESCO and apprised the Committee that the said tender process has been scrapped / cancelled.

6. In light of the above, the Committee observed that the grievance of the Appellant does not exist anymore as the tender called in question has already been scrapped by the Respondent. Therefore, the Appeal in hand is hereby **dismissed being infructuous** and disposed of accordingly, with the direction to the respondent (LESCO) to follow the spirit



of Rule 33 and Rule 34 of PP Rules, 2004, so that, the essence of Rule 4 of the PP Rules, 2004 may be fulfilled.

  
**(Dr. Muhammad Aslam Waseem)**  
Director General (Legal)  
(Member)

  
**(Sheikh Afzaal Raza)**  
Director (M&E)  
(Member)

  
**(Hasnat Ahmed Qureshi)**  
Managing Director (PPRA)  
(Chairman of the Committee)

*Each page of the order has been signed by all members of the Appellate Committee. The order comprises of four (04) pages.*