

GAHC010031142023



THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)

Case No. : WP(C)/850/2023

JYOTIRMOY KALITA
S/O. LT. JOGEN KALITA, R/O. HOUSE NO.37, NEAR NABAJYOTI GAS
AGENCY, HATIGARH CHARIALI, ZOO NARENGI ROAD, GUWAHATI, DIST.
KAMRUP (M), ASSAM, PIN-781024.

VERSUS

THE STATE OF ASSAM AND 2 ORS
REP. BY THE ADDL. CHIEF SECRETARY, WATER RESOURCE DEPTT.,
DISPUR, GUWAHATI-781006.

2:CHIEF ENGINEER

WATER RESOURCE DEPT.
BASISITHA
GUWAHATI
PIN-781029.

3:S.S. ENGINEERS

PROPRIETOR
MR. SUMAN GOGOI
MANDIR PATH
HOUSE NO.36
JAYA NAGAR
KHANAPARA
P.S. DISPUR
GUWAHATI
PIN-781022

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR. B CHAKRABORTY, MRS P HAZARIKA

Advocate for the Respondent : SC, WATER RESOURCE, MS M ZOMUANPUII,MR J SINGH (R-3),MR P DOLEY (R-3),MR H AGARWAL (R-3),MR. R KALITA (R-3),MR. B D KONWAR SR. ADV. (R-3)

**BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MICHAEL ZOTHANKHUMA**

ORDER

23.10.2024

Heard Mr. B. Chakraborty, learned counsel for the petitioner and Ms. R. Deka, learned counsel for the Water Resources Department. Also heard Ms. P. Soren, learned counsel for the respondent No.3.

2. The petitioner's case is that the petitioner participated in the tender process floated by the Water Resources Department, vide NIT dated 20.12.2022, for the work "Immediate measures for restoration of Balbala Marginal Bund at different reaches in between ch 400m and ch 150m L/B of river Jinari under SDRF for the year 2021-22."

3. The petitioner's technical bid was disqualified and the respondent No.3 was allotted the contract work on 15.02.2023. The petitioner has challenged the disqualification of his technical bid and has also challenged the credentials of the respondent No.3 to be allotted the contract work.

4. Mr. B. Chakraborty, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he has not been given any up-to-date instructions by his client as on date.

5. On the other hand, Ms. R. Deka, learned counsel appearing for the Water Resources Department submits that the work contract allotted to the

respondent No.3 has been completed by the respondent No.3, as there was no stay order passed by this Court.

6. In view of the submission made by Ms. R. Deka, the learned counsel for the Water Resources Department, it appears that the writ petition has become infructuous.

7. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed as infructuous.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant