

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.13420 of 2015

=====

1. M/s Singh Construction Pvt. through its Managing Director Shailesh Kumar Singh Son of Late Baleshwar Singh resident of New Satpura Colony, Post office Lane, Aghoriya Bazar, Muzaffarpur, P.S. Kazi Mohammadpur, District - Muzaffarpur

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Secretary, Road Construction Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
2. The Engineer-in-Chief-Cum-Additional Commissioner - Cum - Special Director, Road Construction Department, Government of Bihar
3. The Chief Engineer, North Bihar Road Construction Department, Darbhanga
4. The Superintending Engineer, Road Circle, Muzaffarpur
5. The Executive Engineer, R.C.D., Road Division No. 1, Muzaffarpur

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Jitendra Kumar Roy, Adv.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Yogendra Pd. Sinha, AAG 15

Mr. Rakesh Ambastha, A.C. to AAG 15

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 14-07-2016

Heard Mr. Jitendra Kumar Roy, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Rakesh Ambastha, learned A.C. to AAG 15 for the State.

The petitioner is aggrieved by the order dated 10.11.2014 passed by the respondent no.5 whereby he has been debarred from future tenders until the completion of the work under contract.

The order of debarment against the petitioner was passed by the respondent no. 5 in relation to the work allotted for widening and strengthening of the road running between Maripur Power House to Sakri (N.H.-77) from 0 kilometer to 9.5 Km.

Mr. Ambastha while filing supplementary counter affidavit

refers to an order present at Annexure-1 which is dated 6.7.2016 and whereby the order debarring the petitioner from future tenders has since been revoked.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and in view of the order dated 6.7.2016 of the Executive Engineer Road Division-I, Muzaffarpur brought on record at Annexure-A to the supplementary counter affidavit, the grievance of the petitioner raised in the present writ petition stands redressed.

Mr. Jitendra Kumar Roy now submits that there are certain dues of the petitioner but there is no representation of the petitioner in this regard on record.

Since there is no such written claim of the petitioner pending for disposal with the authorities, hence the petitioner would be well advised to represent before the authority concerned alongwith a discussed claim and who shall consider and dispose of the same in accordance with law expeditiously and preferably within three months of the filing of such representation.

The writ petition is accordingly disposed of

Bibhash/-

(Jyoti Saran, J)

NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	22-7-16
Transmission Date	