



**MES BUILDERS ASSOCIATION OF INDIA (REGD)**  
807-808 Sahyog 58, Nehru Place, New Delhi – 110019  
Tel No. 49537644 E-mail: [mesbai75@yahoo.com](mailto:mesbai75@yahoo.com) Website: [www.mesbai.in](http://www.mesbai.in)

Circular No. 30

Dated: 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2026

To Members,

Minutes of Virtual Meeting of Headquarter Office Bearers held on 10<sup>th</sup> April 2026.

The following office bearers were present.

1. Sh. G.S. Mago, President
2. Sh. Kumar Ashok, Sr. Vice President
3. Sh. C. Balasatish, Vice President
4. Sh. Sandeep Srivastava, Hony. General Secretary
5. Sh. Shiv Kumar Gupta, Hony. Treasurer
6. Sh. Gurvinder Singh Oberoi, Vice President Central Region - A
7. Sh. Sunil Panwar, Vice President Central Region - B
8. Sh. Pankaj Kr. Prahladka, Vice President Eastern Region – A
9. Sh. Vinod Behl, Vice President Northern Region
10. Sh. Deepak M. Balkawade, Vice President Southern (N) Region
11. Sh. M. Sundararajan, Vice President Southern (S) Region
12. Sh. Mahesh Jain, Vice President Western Region

**Opening Remarks.** Sh G.S. Mago welcomed all the participants and thanked them for joining the Virtual Conference Meeting.

**Sh G.S Mago.** I am very concerned that the matters are not moving in the right direction. The situation has become quite complicated and at present even if the E-in-C agrees to any proposal, It would be nothing short of a breakthrough. We have been continuously writing letters of enlistment particularly in the cases where contractors were cancelled and contractors were unable to apply before 30<sup>th</sup> November 2025. However, the authorities remains very rigid in considering renewal requests for those who could not submit their applications before the stipulated date.

In this context, the presentation submitted by Sh. Vinod Behl appears to be a constructive and appropriate step forward. I would also like to highlight that earlier at the time of recycling of enlistment, individual letters were issued to all contractors regarding renewal. However on this time the communication was issued only to the Association whereas every builder is not necessarily a member of the Association. I also pointed out that renewal of enlistment cannot be denied without issuing a show cause notice before the Jt. DG and Director of CCEP. They agreed that cancellation with respect of following due process should not take place and that such action would not be bonafide. It is pertinent that the file had already been forward to the E-in-C prior to receiving two positive response from the Jt DG (works) and DGW.

During the last meeting as well, we pressed for a clear response regarding cancellation of contracts. Another point discussed was the proposed meeting with the E-in-C, the agenda has already been forwarded and we are awaiting his reply. He assured that we would call by evening.

He kept his words and informed me that he had discussed these issues three times during the day and that we may expect a priority response and could contact the E-in-C within two days. Yesterday, when I contacted the E-in-C, he shared the contact numbers of TS. After several follow-ups, I received a call from the Jt DG, who assured that a decision would be conveyed by evening. It was also informed that the E-in-C has constituted a Board and the Board is discussing the matter with the Jt. DG. The Board appears to have a positive mindset towards our concerns.

However, today, during further follow-ups, it was conveyed that the E-in-C questioned the board stating that if a contractor construct a house incorrectly, would he be allowed to build another one? He also indicated that he has the authority for cancellation. As of now, the file has still not been cleared. This is the current position regarding renewal of enlistment in cases involving cancellation of contracts.

It was also submitted that the Performance Guarantee itself is a form of settlement and once punishment and settlement have been effected, the matter should be treated as closed. It is becoming increasingly difficult to respond to our builders, who were hopeful of a positive course of action HQ should adopt, as the present stand does not appear justified. We are hopeful that that the file may be cleared Monday. Now I request Sh. Sandeep Srivastava to proceed with the meeting.

**Sh. Sandeep Srivastava.** We had a meeting with DGW Prior to the Delhi Branch Dairy Function. He clearly stated that the action is not justified and I have already prepared the minutes of the meeting accordingly with the opinion in favour that the punishment should not be imposed. I will also discuss the matter with the other four general officers and brief them that nothing will be achieved by complicating the issue. Let me confirm their views and ascertain the mind of the E-in-C.

**Sh. G.S. Mago.** Last time we informed Maj. Gen. (Now Lt. Gen.) Jaichandran Sir that we would be meeting with E-in-C the next day and requested him to briefly apprise the E-in-C about the issues faced by the builders. He replied that though he is not directly from that field, he would still brief the E-in-C accordingly.

**Sh. Vinod Behl.** Sir if the decision does not come in our favour, it is suggested that full authority be accorded to individual builders to approach the Honourable Court. The Association may extend collective support to such members, while insuring that no financial liability is incurred by the HQ. We should consider initiating a non cooperation movement in a unified manner without any element of groupism. It I clearly mentioned in our previous enlistment documents that contracts would be taken upto 31.12.2025. Many contractors accepted contracts in October and November, However their enlistment have not been renewed by the E-in-C's branch. If the renewal of enlistment is denied, individual members may be advised to approach the Hon'ble Court independently. Simultaneously, a non cooperation movement may be undertaken collectively. Such a coordinated and lawful approach may encourage the authorities to engage with us and resolve the issue through discussion at the earliest.

**Sh. Gurvinder Singh Oberoi.** Sir, it has around 6-8 months since the new E-in-C assumed office and from the very beginning he has been quite forthright and firm in executing his decisions. He does not appear to have much sympathy for the concerns of our builders. In such circumstances our builders may be allowed to exercise their legitimate right to approach the Court, if they so choose. We would extend support to our builders to a reasonable extent. Since approximately 1.5 years of the E-in-C tenure still remains, it would be prudent for us to standby our aggrieved members and allow them the freedom to take appropriate action as deemed necessary.

**Sh. Sunil Panwar.** Sir I am agreed with both Sh. Vinod Behl and Sh. Gurvinder Singh Oberoi. We should leave free our builders to take any action. Some builders are not financially good to approach the Court then HQ should arrange some funds for them also. Suppose if a builders expenses is around one lakh, then we should help them for around Rs. 25,000/-.

**Sh. G.S. Mago.** As suggested by Sh. Vinod Behl, Sh. Gurvinder Singh Oberoi and Sh. Sunil Panwar, I would like to convey that HQ has not restrained anyone from approaching the Court. Infact some members approached the court and have also obtained favourable judgement. Moreover . our MOA also provides members with the right to seek legal recourse including approaching the court if they so desire.

**Sh. Sandeep Srivastava.** Some members have complained that they did not receive any letter or intimation, including show cause notices regarding renewal of enlistment of their contracts. However in the original registration letter it is clearly mention that the enlistment was valid upto 31.12.2025. Further six SS class contractors have personally approached me and informed that they did not even apply for renewal of enlistment upto 31.12.2025.

**Sh. Mahesh Jain.** I agree with you all. Last time when we went for the meeting then his body language shows that he is not agree for this matter. I want to suggest you we should prepare a platform on which we can bring all the members whose renewal is denied due to cancellation of contacts so that we can jointly approach the Court and get a positive response from E-in-C because it is difficult to help individual builder financially.

**Sh. G.S. Mago.** Firstly I want to say that HQ did not stop anybody to approach the Court. Secondly if you all agrees then our Advocate can approach the Court in this matter as it is already discussed with the Advocate as approaching the Court is the last option.

**Sh. Kumar Ashok.** I want to suggest that we should conduct a meeting with E-in-C before approaching the Court because may be Jt. DG or DGW were unable to express the problem in a better way. Thereafter also if we did not get the positive response then we should promote individual to approach the Court. On behalf of individual, Association should approach the Court. If association brings a positive response from the Court, then in future it will be a fear for E-in-C that the Association can approach the Court. We should conduct a meeting with Defence Minister or E-in-C and thereafter if we did not get positive response then Association should Approach the Court instead of individual.

**Sh. Deepak Balkawade.** Firstly we should approach the RM. If we did not get the positive response from him then conduct a Press Conference in Delhi. If we did not get positive response from Press Conference then we should conduct a meeting with Defence Minister and If thereafter also we did not get positive response then we should approach he Court. If we directly approach the Court, then E-in-C will say that let the decision came from the end and as you know Court Cases takes a lot of time in giving a decision. If we decide to approach the Court then Association should approach the court instead of Individual because as you know It is very costly to approach the Court. Also if individual approach the Court then everybody has different problems or views so the decision will not come easily. According to me, approaching the Court should be the last option.If we approach the Court, Neither the Minister or E-in-C nor DGW will do anything.

**Sh. Shiv Kumar Gupta.** I would like to echo almost the same sentiments as expressed by Sh Deepak Balkawade. At present, many among us are considering approaching the Court. There have been one or two similar instances in the past where the Association contemplated legal action, but it was ultimately avoided. As rightly pointed out by Sh Deepak Balkawade, once we approach the Court, the matter may get prolonged with multiple hearings and thereafter other

avenues of resolution may effectively close. Therefore, we all agree that approaching the Court should remain the last option.

We may instead follow a small but structured roadmap. As suggested by Sh Kumar Ashok, the first step should be to seek a meeting with the E-in-C. We have already made efforts in this regard and will again attempt to secure a meeting within the next 2-3 days. If no positive response is received, the second step could be to organize a one day nationwide strike.

Thereafter, we may prepare a comprehensive submission outlining the entire scenario, particularly the negative response from the E-in-C over the past eight months and forward it to the Defence Minister, Minister of State for Defence and even the Prime Minister. Negotiations are always more effective when backed by collective strength, and we should convey that the Association is united and resolute.

As a further step, we may also organize a press conference with all office bearers. We had earlier conducted a press conference at the Press Club during 2017-2018 which yielded a positive response. These steps can be undertaken within the next 15 days. If, even after these efforts, no favourable outcome emerges, we may then proceed with the final option of approaching the Court. From the beginning, I have also suggested that affected members may approach the Court in their individual capacity. However, one important aspect must be kept in mind, if the Court's decision does not go in our favour, the overall position may weaken considerably. Considering this, in the earlier instance as well, cases were filed after careful deliberation.

**Sh. Vinod Behl.** Sir I would like to submit that those members who have approached the Hon'ble Court in individual capacity have already obtained stay order also and have been granted the next date of hearing. In Jammu an Advocate charges Rs. 40,000/- and provide stay order. If a large number of members say around 500 cases are filed individually against the E-in-C's branch, it may create sufficient ground for the authorities to initiate discussion and come forward for negotiation to resolve the issue amicably.

**Sh. Shiv Kumar Gupta.** Sir, Court will take time in giving decision against Defence. However if 500 cases were filed individually against E-in-C, then It will definitely put some impact on E-in-C.

**Sh. Sandeep Srivastava.** How can 500 cases be filed in Court ? Not more than 10 members are willing to approach the court. It is comparatively easier to lodge complaints through CP GRAMS, yet our members are not even inclined to file complaints through that platform. Even when we circulated a letter in various groups requesting firm whose renewal of enlistment is pending to share relevant documents we did not receive even 50 response.

**Sh. Gurvinder Singh Oberoi.** As we have seen in the last renewal also, we put our every efforts for the renewal of Enlistment but in the end we did not get any result. Now again we are going to start the same exercise. We are not running a school as members are matured and fully aware of the procedure. They should apply for renewal within the stipulated time period. Ultimately, they have to fight their own battle and the Association can only extend guidance and moral support where ever required.

**Sh. Shiv Kumar Gupta.** I totally agrees with Sh. Sandeep Srivastava and Sh. Gurvinder Singh Oberoi. Now it is become a tendency like a SS Class contractor apply for renewal of enlistment in February 2026 and request us to provide them help through HQ.

**Sh. Sandeep Srivastava.** First of all I should contact with DG MAP and General Rajesh ji to know the internal situation because that input is very important for us. As I have said earlier, fighting cannot be the solution to any problem. I think we have to face the same situation till May 2027 as nobody knows his forthcoming schedule.

**Sh. M. Sundararajan.** In my region there is no issue where renewal of enlistment is pending due to Cancellation of Contracts. Only 3-4 persons are there whose renewal is pending but they are not our members. We should conduct a meeting with E-in-C and make him understand the issue. My suggestion is Individual should approach the court instead of Association but Association can support him.

**Sh. G.S. Mago.** Thank you for sharing your views. The issue is indeed very serious and considering the background from which our organization has evolved, we must take appropriate and measured action to demonstrate the unity of the builders and their resolve to safeguard their rights. As suggested by all of you, we should plan our course of action within the next 10-15 days. I believe that by Monday we may receive a decision from E-in-C, who is also likely to be under some pressure in this matter. If a positive response is received, the issue may stand resolved. However, in case of a negative response, the first step should be to address a representation to the Defence Minister by Monday itself.

Secondly, we may organize symbolic protest actions such as a on day strike, wearing black ribbons or holding dharnas across the country. This will require active coordination by all VPs so that we can effectively demonstrate that builders across the country are united against the perceived injustice. We should also proceed in accordance with the laid down procedures and relevant provisions of IAFW-2249 and thereafter, if required, consider approaching the Court as a last resort. Before taking any such legal step, we should again convene a meeting among ourselves and take a collective decision based on the suggestions received from all concerned.

**Sh. Kumar Ashok.** We should conduct a physical meeting with E-in-C and I am sure his views will be different in direct physical meeting. Denial of Renewal of Enlistment due to Cancellation of Contracts is not a Clause in 2249. It is just a back door entry. I hope so, he will definitely provide relief. He is already convinced that there is no clause in CPWD or railways of the same matter. He is ignoring us because of his habit. I am sure that he will provide us relief within 5-10 days. In the last meeting also he agrees that if President want to meet him in 24 hours then he will surely be available.

**Sh. Sunil Panwar.** Sh Kumar Ashok Ji, earlier the same same Chief Engineer comes in Bareilly. He also did not want to meet with the builder and did not do any work. If builder come in front of him then he talk very nice and sweet to them but take the decision against the builders.

(Sandeep Srivastava)  
Hony. Gen. Secretary  
HQ, MES BAI