

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10804 of 2015**

=====

Nain Chhabila Nayan, S/o Sri Bir Narayan Singh, Resident of Village + Post  
Bhan Borhan, P.S. Jandaha, District Vaishali

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar, through Secretary, Public Health Engineering Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Chief Engineer, Public Health Engineering Department, Muzaffarpur.
3. The Superintending Engineer, Public Health Engineering Department, Circle – Muzaffarpur.
4. The Executive Engineer, Public Health Division, Hajipur, Vaishali.
5. M/s Pappu Enterprises, Proprietor Mundrika Singh, S/o name not known, Resident of village Bithauli, P.S. Sarai, District Vaishali
6. Ramesh Kumar, S/o Mundrika Singh, Resident of village Bithauli, P.S. Sarai, District Vaishali

... .. Respondents

=====

**Appearance :**

|                     |   |                               |
|---------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner  | : | Mr. Ram Ganesh                |
|                     |   | Mrs. Shelly Kumari, Advocates |
| For the Respondents | : | Mr. Manish Kumar, AC to GP 28 |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN**  
**ORAL JUDGMENT**

**Date : 17-12-2018**

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

*“(i) For issuance of an appropriate writ commanding the respondents to take action against respondent no.5 for his alleged misconduct with regard to tender No. 02/2014-2015 & Retender No. 03/2014-2015 and Retender No. 03/2015-2016.*

*(ii) For issuance of an appropriate writ commanding the respondents to cancel the tender of respondent no. 5 and 6 with regard to NIT No. 08/2014-2015.*

*(iii) For issuance of an appropriate writ commanding the respondents not to take final decision with regard to NIT No. 08/2014-2015 before taking final decision on the representation filed by the petitioner.*



*(iv) For any other relief or reliefs for which the petitioner is entitled under law as well as on facts of the case.”*

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the writ petition has become infructuous by efflux of time as the period of contract was for 18 months which has since elapsed and hence, it need not be pressed.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents appears.

4. The writ petition accordingly stands dismissed.

**(Vikash Jain, J)**

BT/Chandran

|                   |            |
|-------------------|------------|
| AFR/NAFR          | NAFR       |
| CAV DATE          | N.A.       |
| Uploading Date    | 19.12.2018 |
| Transmission Date | N.A.       |

