

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPC No. 914 of 2019**

- M/s Sai Construction, Through Its Partner, Atul Shukla S/o Shri Sudama Prasad Shukla, Aged About 46 Years R/o Green Park Colony, Jarahabhata, Police Station Civil Lines, Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Public Works Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, New Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. The Engineer - In - Chief Public Works Department, Nirman Bhawan, North Block, Sector - 19, Atal Nagar, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
3. The Chief Engineer (Planning) , Public Works Department, Nirman Bhawan, North Block, Sector - 19, Atal Nagar, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
4. The Chief Engineer, Public Works Department , Nirman Bhawan, Bilaspur Zone, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	: Shri Sunil Otwani, Advocate
For Respondents/State	: Shri Gagan Tiwari, Deputy Government Advocate

Hon'ble Shri P. R. Ramachandra Menon, Chief Justice**Hon'ble Shri Manindra Mohan Shrivastava, Judge****Order on Board****Per, P. R. Ramachandra Menon, Chief Justice****15.05.2019**

1. The Petitioner approaches this Court with the following prayers :

“10.1 That, the suitable writ/direction may kindly be issued directing the respondent No.2 to allow the petitioner to participate in the tender process initiated by the NIT dated 01.02.2019. It is further prayed by the petitioner that the last date for opening of this bid may kindly be extended for a further period of 15 days.

10.2 Any other further order(s) as deemed fit and necessary by this Hon'ble Court in the interest of justice.”

2. The crux of the case is that the registration of the Petitioner came to be suspended which was under challenge before this Court and as per order dated 18.02.2019 passed in WPC No. 2850 of 2018, an interim stay has been granted with regard to the suspension. In the said circumstances, the Petitioner has moved the Respondent again to consider his candidature for tender, which however, has not been considered and hence the grievance.

3. The learned counsel representing the State submits, on the basis of instruction received, that the suspension has already been revoked and the Petitioner's bid could be considered, but the fact remains that because of various other reasons, the authority decided not to proceed with the tender already notified any further. It is stated that, if at all further cause arises, a fresh tender notification will be issued and it will be open for the parties concerned to participate in the process, based on the credentials and the qualifications prescribed.
4. In the said circumstances, nothing remains to be considered or adjudicated in this writ petition. The writ petition stands dismissed.

Sd/-
(P.R. Ramachandra Menon)
Chief Justice

Sd/-
(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)
Judge