

HIGH COURT of CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPC No. 2229 of 2021

- CBJ Search, having its registered office at Aamapara, Bajrang Nagar, beside CPL Lab, Raipur Chhattisgarh, Proprietor Shri Vikash Sharma, aged about 32 years, S/o Shri Rajendra Prasad Sharma, R/o CBJ Search, Infront of Ajanta Furniture-Bajrang Nagar, District Raipur Chhattisgarh 492001.

Through Shri Abhishek Kumar Goutam, Power of Attorney Holder in the present writ petition aged about 47 years, S/o Shri Santosh Singh Rajput, Permanent Address Gulab Nagar, Mopka Dist. Bilaspur Chhattisgarh 495006

-----Petitioner

VERSUS

1. State of Chhattisgarh through its Secretary, School Education Department, Mantralaya, Nava Raipur District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Director Public Instructions, Directorate of Public Instructions, Nava Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. Collector, Jashpur, District Jashpur Chhattisgarh
4. District Education Officer, District Education Office, Jashpur Chhattisgarh
5. People Development Society Bishrampur, District Surajpur Chhattisgarh

-----Respondents

For Petitioner	: Mr. Gary Mukhopadhyay, Advocate
For Respondent- State	: Mr. Sudep Agrawal, Dy. Adv. Gen.

(Through Video Conferencing)

Hon'ble Shri P. Sam Koshy, Judge
Hon'ble Shri Parth Prateem Sahu, Judge

ORDER

Per Parth Prateem Sahu, J.

24/05/2021

1. This writ petition has been filed against the work order dated 27.04.2021 issued by Respondent 4/ District Education Officer, Jashpur Chhattisgarh.
2. Mr. Gary Mukhopadhyay, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the respondents-authorities have awarded the contract to Respondent 5 in a very arbitrary manner without following the due procedure of law.

3. Mr. Sudeep Agrawal, learned Deputy Advocate General submits that perusal of Annexure P-1, which is under challenge, itself shows that the period for supply of tablets is within 30-days from the date of work order ie. 27.04.2021. He submits that as per the instructions received by him from District Education Officer, Jashpur, the articles which are subject matter of the present tender proceedings, have already been supplied by Respondent 5.
4. Looking to the submissions made by the learned Deputy Advocate General, nothing remains in this writ petition for adjudication.
5. Accordingly, writ petition is dismissed. However, petitioner would be at liberty to approach the appropriate authority by filing appropriate proceedings available under the law, if so desire.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Vacation Judge

Sd/-
(Parth Prateem Sahu)
Vacation Judge