

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.22572 of 2013

=====

M/S Kumar Construction through its proprietor Mr. Suresh Kumar Son Of Sri Ram Prasad Singh Resident Of Mohalla - Station Road Hilsa, P.O. + P.S. Hilsa, District - Nalanda, State - Bihar

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar Through The Secretary, Rural Works Department, 'Vishweshwaraiya Bhawan' Bailey Road, Patna - 15
2. The Engineer-in-Chief, Rural Works Department, 'Vishweshwaraiya Bhawan' Bailey Road, Patna - 15
3. The Chief Engineer - 1, Rural Works Department, 'Vishweshwaraiya Bhawan' Bailey Road, Patna - 15
4. The Superintending Engineer, Rural Works Department, Works Circle, Biharsharif (Nalanda) - 803101
5. The Executive Engineer, Rural Works Department, Works Division, Hilsa, (Nalanda)
6. Mr. Ashok Kumar, the Executive Engineer, Rural Works Department, Works Division, Hilsa, (Nalanda)
7. Mr. Ram Sunder Sahu, the Assistant Engineer, Rural Work Department, Work - Sub - Division, Karai Persurai, (Nalanda)

... .. Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Manish Sahay, Advocate
For the Respondents : Mr. Avnish Nandan Sinha, GP 11

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 04-12-2018

The present writ petition has been filed for the following reliefs –

“(i) For quashing of decision dated 18/10/2013 of Technical Bid Evaluation Committee as contained in Annexure-6, with (sic) relates to petitioner only, because the said committee has declared the petitioner fails in his technical bid in most arbitrary and malafidy manner as well as having ulterior motive against the petitioner.

(ii) For further commanding the concerned respondent to reconsider the said bid of the petitioner



afresh and decide the same in accordance with law, because he does fulfill all criteria of NIT and the technical bid is acceptable.

(iii) For passing, such an order or orders for which the petitioner is entitled under the law in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

2. Mr. Manish Sahay, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that the writ petition has become infructuous and hence, it need not be pressed.

3. The writ petition accordingly stands dismissed.

(Vikash Jain, J)

BT/Chandran

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	05.12.2018
Transmission Date	N.A.

