

THE HIGH COURT OF TRIPURA
AGARTALA

W.P. (C) 479 of 2014

Sri Pradip Kr. Ghosh
S/O Lt. Nepal Ch. Ghosh,
Sibnagar, College Road, West Tripura
District, Agartala, 799001.

..... *Petitioner*

- Vs. -

1. The State of Tripura
Represented by the Secretary,
To the Govt. of Tripura,
Fisheries Department,
Civil Secretariat, Agartala.
2. The Director of Fisheries,
Govt. of Tripura,
Pandit Neheru Complex,
Gurkhabasti, Agartala – 799006.
3. M/S Tripura Cattle Fish,
Proprietor Sri Goutam Chowdhury,
Chowmuhan Bazar, Sekerkote,
West Tripura, Office
Ramnagar, Road No.5, Agartala.
4. M/S Prasanta Dey
Bhattapukur, P.S & P.O. A.D. Nagar,
Agartala, West Tripura – 799003.
5. Sri Binoy Kr. Das
Badharghat, Sreepalli,
P.O: Dukli, West Tripura, Agartala.

..... *Respondents*

BEFORE
HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. DEEPAK GUPTA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S. TALAPATRA

For the Petitioner : Mr. N. Majumder, Advocate.

For the respondent : Mr. S. Chakraborty, Addl. GA.
Nos.1 & 2.

For the respondent : Mr. B. Banerjee, Advocate.
Nos. 3 to 5.

Date of hearing & : 20.01.2015.
delivery of
Judgment & Order

Whether fit for : No.
reporting

JUDGMENT & ORDER (ORAL)

(Deepak Gupta, CJ.)

The main grievance of the petitioner is that he had submitted his tender for supply of fish feed to the Department of Fisheries and that his tender was the lowest, but the Department had wrongly placed orders on the private respondents whose rates were higher.

2. On 01.12.2014, based on this allegation made by the petitioner, we had issued notice to the Department. The Department has filed reply and has stated that the tender of the petitioner was not considered because the tender was declared to be informal since the tenderer had not furnished Demand Draft as specified in the NIT.

3. This Court has already decided this issue in ***W.P. (C) No. 433 of 2014*** and held that it is for the Department Inviting Tenders to decide on which bank the bank draft should be drawn. We had thrice called upon the petitioner to inform us that in view of this reply what steps he wants to take. The only reply given by

the learned counsel is that his client had never been informed about this fact that his tender had been declared informal. At least in the reply this fact has been stated and no prayer has been made by the petitioner that he wants to challenge this order.

4. Therefore, we find no merit in the petition, which is accordingly dismissed.

JUDGE

CHIEF JUSTICE

sima