

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11670 of 2014

=====

Amarjeet Kumar Singh, son of Sri Kanhaiya Prasad Singh, resident of village- Maripur Khurd, PO- Natwar Semariya, PS- Manjhi, District- Saran, Authorized representative of local public.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar, the District Magistrate, Saran at Chapra.
2. The District Magistrate, Saran, at and PO- Chapra, District- Saran.
3. The District Development Commissioner Saran, Chapra, at and P.O.- Chapra, District- Saran.
4. The Executive Engineer, Road Construction Department, Road Division, Chapra, at and PO- Chapra, District- Saran.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Jitendra Kumar, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Pratik Kumar Sinha, A.C. to G.A.XII

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

And

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE I. A. ANSARI

ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

2 05-01-2015 The petitioner claims to be the resident of Maripur Khurd Village of Manjhi Block of Saran District. On 21.06.2014, a tender notice was issued by the respondents for construction of a bridge over Sondhi river in Maripur village. The petitioner's challenge is the tender notice. The first ground is that the place where the bridge is proposed to be constructed, is not suitable. The second ground is that no approach road is there to connect the bridge.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

the learned counsel for the respondents.

Even from the averment made in the writ petition it appears that the proposal was pending for quite sometime and after due verification, the tender notice was issued for construction of the bridge. It hardly needs any mention that before the site is selected for construction of a bridge so much work goes into it; be it in the context of selection of site or determining the structural or financial aspects. It is only after the matter is examined at various levels, that it is cleared.

We certainly appreciate the endeavour of the petitioner to ensure that the bridge is constructed at an appropriate place. However, it is not for us to determine it. The engineering staff is expected to take into account, the physical condition, direction of water flow and financial implications, before choosing a particular place. The petitioner is not able to satisfy this Court on those aspects.

Secondly, the question of constructing approach road would arise only when the bridge is constructed and one cannot complain, even before the bridge is constructed. We are not inclined to stop the construction of the bridge on account of objection raised

by one person or his so called supporters.

The writ petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

Interlocutory application, if any, shall stand disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

(L. Narasimha Reddy, CJ)

(I. A. Ansari, J)

Sunil/-

U			
---	--	--	--