

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (C) No. 1914 of 2015**

M/s. Karunawati Singh Through Proprietor Smt. Karunawati Singh W/o Shri Deependra Singh, aged about 32 years, Resident of village Barondhi, Post Bhatgaon, P.S. Bhatgaon, District Surajpur, Chhattisgarh.

---- **Petitioner****Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh through the Secretary, Public Works Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Mantralaya, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. The Chief Municipal Officer, Nagar Panchayat, Jarhi, District Surajpur, Chhattisgarh.
3. The Superintending Engineer, Nagar Panchayat, Jarhi, District Surajpur, Chhattisgarh.
4. The Executive Engineer, Nagar Panchayat, Jarhi, District Surajpur, Chhattisgarh.

---- **Respondents**

For Petitioner	:	Shri Apoorva Tripathi, Advocate.
For Respondents/State	:	Shri Prafull N Bharat, Additional Advocate General.

Hon'ble Shri Navin Sinha, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board**28/10/2015**

1. Heard Learned Counsel for the Petitioner and Learned Additional Advocate General on behalf of the State.
2. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner submits that after dismissal of Writ Petition (C) No. 1827 of 2015 on the previous occasion on 12.10.2015, the Petitioner wishes to now place the fact that it became aware of the reason for rejection of its bid on 3.10.2015. It is next submitted that in any event, the bids have not been finalized till date with any bidder.
3. Learned Additional Advocate General opposes the writ application referring to the earlier order dated 12.10.2015 dismissing the writ petition by a reasoned order.
4. We have considered the submissions on behalf of the parties.

5. Writ Petition (C) No. 1827 of 2015, inter alia notices that the writ petition itself was filed nearly one month after the last date for submission of bids. There was always an urgency in commercial matters. There was no pleading that on what date the Petitioner was informed that its bid was not acceptable. There was no explanation for approaching the Court one month later. There was no statement that till the date of filing of writ petition, bid has not been settled with any bidder.

6. In our considered opinion, the present writ petition is completely barred on the same issue on principles of res-judicata and also that no one, even if it be the State, can be vexed twice over on the same issue as matters both of public policy and for giving finality to the litigation.

7. The writ petition is dismissed.

Sd/-
(Navin Sinha)
CHIEF JUSTICE

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE