

GAHC010078972020



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

Case No. : WP(C)/2400/2020

M/S. H.R.D. COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL SECURITY FORCE PVT. LTD.
REP. BY ITS DIRECTOR MD. SUHEL AHMED, S/O. JALAL UDDIN HEAD
OFFICE S.T. ROAD, BADARPUR, DIST. KARIMGANJ, ASSAM, PIN-788803,
REGIONAL OFFICE LACHIT LANE, H.NO.4 RAJGARH ROAD, GUWAHATI-
781005, KAMRUP (M), ASSAM.

VERSUS

THE UNION OF INDIA AND 5 ORS.
REP. BY THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, MINISTRY OF CIVIL AVIATION, NEW
DELHI, DELHI-110021.

2:THE DIRECTORATE OF CIVIL AVIATION

REP. BY DIRECTOR GENERAL
DEPTT. OF CIVIL AVIATION
NEW DELHI
DELHI RAJIV GHANDHI BHAWAN
SAFDURJUNG
AIRPORT
NEW DELHI-110003.

3:THE REGIONAL DIRECTOR

BUREAU OF CIVIL AVIATION SECURITY LGBI
AIRPORT
GUWAHATI-781015.

4:THE JOINT GENERAL MANAGER (ATSEP)
AIRPORTS AUTHORITY OF INDIA
LGBI AIRPORT
GUWAHATI-781015.

5:THE JOINT GENERAL MANAGER (CNS)

AIRPORTS AUTHORITY OF INDIA
LGBI AIRPORT
GUWAHATI-781015.

6:THE ASSTT. GENERAL MANAGER (CNS)

AIRPORTS AUTHORITY OF INDIA
LGBI AIRPORT
GUWAHATI-781015

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR. S SAHU,

Advocate for the Respondent : ASSTT.S.G.I., MRS. A GAYAN (R-1 TO 3),MR. B D DEKA (PANEL ADVOCATE, AAI)

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MICHAEL ZOTHANKHUMA

ORDER

28.10.2024

Mr. S. Sahu, learned counsel appears for the petitioner. Mr. N. Chaudhury, learned counsel appears for the respondent nos.4 to 6, while Ms. A. Gayan, learned counsel appears for the respondent no.1.

The petitioner's contract work was terminated on 08.05.2020.

The petitioner's case is that it was awarded a work order for providing job service contract of Multi Tasking Staff for Up-keeping/conservancy work for CNS Department at LGBI Airport by the respondent no.6, on behalf of the respondent no.5. Thereafter an agreement was executed between the Airport Authority of India and the petitioner for implementation of the contract work, which was to commence from 09.12.2019 and continue until 08.12.2020.

On considering the fact that the agreement executed between the parties had expired on 08.12.2020, this Court is of the view that the present writ petition has become infructuous.

Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed as infructuous.

Dismissal of the case shall not be a bar for the petitioner to make any claim that the petitioner feels it is entitled to as per law.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant