

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.12294 of 2012

- =====
1. Jitendra Prasad Singh son of late Suryadeo Singh Resident of Mohalla- Lal Kothi, Nutan Nagar, P.S.- Civil Line, District- Gaya
 2. Waris Buildcon India Private Limited through its Director, Ramjanam Sharma, son of late Bhuneshwar Sharma, resident of Mohalla- Waris Kutir, Lakhibagh, P.S.- Muffasil, District- Gaya

.... Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Urban Development Department, Govt. Of Bihar, Patna
2. The Chief Engineer, Bihar Urban Development and Housing Department, Vikas Bhawan, New Secretariate, Patna
3. The Chief Engineer, Urban Development Department, Government of Bihar, Patna
4. The Superintending Engineer, Urban Development Department, Government of Bihar, Patna
5. District Urban Development Authority, Gaya through Its Chairman District Magistrate, Gaya
6. The District Magistrate, Gaya
7. The Executive Engineer, District Urban Development Authority, Gaya
8. R.B.S. Construction through its partner Sanjiv Kumar Jha, Patliputra, Patna- 13, P.S.- Patliputra, District- Patna

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioners : Mr. Dinu Kumar,
Mr. Shiw Kumar Prabhakar, Advocates

For the Respondents : Mr. Lalit Kishor, Pr. AAG

For Respondent No. 8 : Mr. L.K. Sharma,
Mr. Rajesh Kumar,
Mr. Arun Kumar Pandey, Advocates

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 05-07-2016

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, leaned counsel
for the State and learned counsel for the respondent no. 8.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for a
direction to the respondents to produce before the Hon'ble High Court
the entire record pertaining to short tender invitation notice no.

3/2011-12 and technical bid and financial bid record and the order by which tender has been allowed in favour of RBS construction (Private respondent) so that the conscionable justice is done to the petitioners by quashing the work order granted in favour of the private respondent and adverse order to the petitioner recorded in the concerned file including relevant records; and for connected reliefs.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners fairly states that the relevant tender i.e. Tender Invitation Notice No. 03/2011-12 contemplated a period of one year for completion of the work in question, which has already elapsed.

4. In that view of the mater, the prayer in the writ petition has been rendered infructuous by efflux of time and no positive relief can be granted at this belated stage.

5. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed as having become infructuous.

(Vikash Jain, J)

B.T/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	11.07.2016
Transmission Date	N/A