

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11098 of 2019**

=====

M/S Amarjeet Kumar, (Male), aged about 27 years, Son of Sri Amod Mehta,  
Resident of Ward No. 17, Police Station- Khagaria, District- Khagaria.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through District Magistrate, Khagaria.
2. The District Magistrate, Khagaria.
3. The District Magistrate-cum-Chairman, District Transport Committee, Khagaria.
4. The Deputy Development Commissioner, Khagaria.
5. The Additional Collector, Khagaria.
6. The District Transport Officer, Khagaria.
7. Bihar State Food and Civil Supply Corporation Ltd., Khadya Bhawan, Daroga Rai Path, R. Block, Road No. 2, Patna through its Managing Director.
8. The Managing Director, Bihar State Food and Civil Supply Corporation Ltd., Khadya Bhawan, Daroga Rai Path, R. Block, Road No. 2, Patna.
9. The District Manager, Bihar State Food and Civil Supply Corporation Ltd., Khagaria.
10. Sri Balram Kumar, (Male), aged about 33 years, Son of Sri Ramnarayan Lal Khatri, Resident of Village- Bidupur Bazaar, Hazipur, District- Vaishali.
11. Sri Pravin Kumar Chaudhary, (Male), aged about 44 years, Son of Sri Balmiki Chaudhary, Resident of Village- Akhatiyarpur, Post- Rajaura, District- Begusarai.

... .. Respondents

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mrs. Namrata Mishra, Advocate  
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Kumar Samarjeet Singh AC to SC 21

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      07-11-2019                      After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the Corporation, what has appeared to be an admitted position is that the petitioner did not fulfill the essential conditions for award of tender because he was not having minimum five registered vehicles in his



name.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted before this court that he is not looking for the award of tender for himself and does not dispute this position but at the same time he is aggrieved by the selection of private respondent no. 10 & 11, because they have been selected despite there being discrepancies on their part in the matter of fulfilling conditions.

Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the Corporation, this court is of the considered opinion that in the admitted case of the petitioner where he does not have eligibility to get the work and for that reason he is not looking for the award of the tender, this court finds no reason to entertain a complaint as regards selection of private respondent and disturb the whole selection process which has already been completed.

The Writ Application has, thus, no merit. It is dismissed accordingly.

**(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)**

Rajeev/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

