

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7406 of 2022

Maurya Motors Private Limited having its registered office at Plot C- 1, Patliputra Industrial Area, Industrial Estate, Patna- 800013 through its Authorized Representative, Mr. Indra Mohan Jha, (Male) aged about 52 years, S/o Late Mr. Ram Kripal Singh, presently posted as Legal Manager at Patna Branch Office situated at Maurya Motors Private Limited, Plot C- 1, Patliputra Industrial Area, Industrial Area, Industrial Estate, Patna- 800013

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Secretariat, Patna- 800001
2. Bihar Medical Services and Infrastructure Corporation Limited Through its Managing Director, 4th Floor, Bihar Medical Services and Infrastructure Corporation Limited, Hospital Road, Shastri Nagar, Patna- 800023.
3. Additional Chief Secretary cum Food Safety Commissioner Patna Government of Bihar, 1st Floor, Vikas Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna- 800013.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Dhananjaya Kashyap, Advocate Mr. Dayanand Singh, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. P.K. Verma, AAG-3
For Respondent No.2	:	Mr. Rana Vikram Singh, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. KUMAR

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date : 27-07-2022

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

Petitioner has prayed for the following relief(s):-

- i. For issuance of writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing / setting aside of communication dated 29.03.2022 made by the Respondents through the online portal whereby the Petitioner Company has been disqualified from the Bid Number: GEM/2022/B/1943616 and Bid Number: GEM/2022/B/1943713 despite being suitably qualified in



accordance with the tender terms and conditions.

ii. For issuance of writ in the nature of mandamus commanding and directing the Respondents to declare the Petitioner to be qualified in Bid Number: GEM/2022/B/1943616 and Bid Number: GEM/2022/B/1943713 as the decision of disqualifying the Petitioner company on the "*grounds of non-submission of documents pertaining to Air Conditioning and certificate of medical equipment*" is based on frivolous and *non est* grounds as the Petitioner Company had already submitted the requisite certificate pertaining to air conditioning issued by Automotive Research Association of India (hereinafter referred to as 'ARAI') and further the Petitioner Company had submitted self declaration undertaking / certificate with respect to medical equipment as per the advice of GM Procurement in the meeting held on 25.03.2022.

iii. For issuance of writ in the nature of mandamus commanding and directing the Respondents to consider the representation dated 02.04.2022 presented before the Respondent No. 2 and 3 whereby the Petitioner Company has requested the Respondents to reconsider the technical evaluation of both tenders issued by Respondents.

iv. For issuance of writ in the nature of mandamus commanding

After the matter was heard for some time, finding



the Bench not to be agreeable with the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, learned counsel for the petitioner, under instructions, states that petitioner shall be content if a direction is issued to the authority concerned to consider and decide the representation which the petitioner shall be filing within a period of four weeks from today for redressal of the grievance(s).

Mr. Rana Vikram Singh, learned counsel for respondent No.2 states that the entire process of allotment of works stands completed and work has already been allotted to third party. However, he further submits that if such a representation is filed by the petitioner, the authority concerned shall consider and dispose it of expeditiously and preferably within a period of three months from the date of its filing along with a copy of this order.

Statement accepted and taken on record.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *D. N. Jeevaraj Vs. Chief Secretary, Government of Karnataka & Ors, (2016) 2 SCC 653*, paragraphs 34 to 38 observed as under:-

“34. The learned counsel for the parties addressed us on the question of the bona fides of Nagalaxmi Bai in filing a public interest litigation. We leave this question open and do not express any opinion on the correctness or otherwise of the decision of the High Court in this regard.

35. However, we note that generally speaking, procedural technicalities ought to take a back seat in



public interest litigation. This Court held in *Rural Litigation and Entitlement Kendra v. State of U.P.* [*Rural Litigation and Entitlement Kendra v. State of U.P.*, 1989 Supp (1) SCC 504] to this effect as follows: (SCC p. 515, para 16)

“16. The writ petitions before us are not inter parties disputes and have been raised by way of public interest litigation and the controversy before the court is as to whether for social safety and for creating a hazardless environment for the people to live in, mining in the area should be permitted or stopped. We may not be taken to have said that for public interest litigations, procedural laws do not apply. At the same time it has to be remembered that every technicality in the procedural law is not available as a defence when a matter of grave public importance is for consideration before the court.”

36. A considerable amount has been said about public interest litigation in *R&M Trust v. Koramangala Residents Vigilance Group*, (2005) 3 SCC 91] and it is not necessary for us to dwell any further on this except to say that in issues pertaining to good governance, the courts ought to be somewhat more liberal in entertaining public interest litigation. However, in matters that may not be of moment or a litigation essentially directed against one organisation or individual (such as the present litigation which was directed only against Sadananda Gowda and later Jeevaraj was impleaded) ought not to be entertained or should be rarely entertained. Other remedies are also available to public spirited litigants and they should be encouraged to avail of such remedies.

37. In such cases, that might not strictly fall in the category of public interest litigation and for which other remedies are available, insofar as the issuance of a writ of mandamus is concerned, this Court held in *Union of India v. S.B. Vohra* [*Union of India v. S.B. Vohra*, (2004) 2 SCC 150: 2004 SCC (L&S) 363] that: (SCC p. 160, paras 12-13)

“12. Mandamus literally means a command. The essence of mandamus in England was that it was a royal command issued by the King's Bench (now Queen's Bench) directing performance of a public legal duty.



13. A writ of mandamus is issued in favour of a person who establishes a legal right in himself. A writ of mandamus is issued against a person who has a legal duty to perform but has failed and/or neglected to do so. Such a legal duty emanates from either in discharge of a public duty or by operation of law. The writ of mandamus is of a most extensive remedial nature. The object of mandamus is to prevent disorder from a failure of justice and is required to be granted in all cases where law has established no specific remedy and whether justice despite demanded has not been granted.”

38. A salutary principle or a well-recognised rule that needs to be kept in mind before issuing a writ of mandamus was stated in *Saraswati Industrial Syndicate Ltd. v. Union of India* [*Saraswati Industrial Syndicate Ltd. v. Union of India*, (1974) 2 SCC 630] in the following words: (SCC pp. 641-42, paras 24-25)

“24. ... The powers of the High Court under Article 226 are not strictly confined to the limits to which proceedings for prerogative writs are subject in English practice. Nevertheless, the well-recognised rule that no writ or order in the nature of a mandamus would issue when there is no failure to perform a mandatory duty applies in this country as well. Even in cases of alleged breaches of mandatory duties, the salutary general rule, which is subject to certain exceptions, applied by us, as it is in England, when a writ of mandamus is asked for, could be stated as we find it set out in *Halsbury's Laws of England* (3rd Edn.), Vol. 11, p. 106:

‘198. *Demand for performance must precede application.*—As a general rule the order will not be granted unless the party complained of has known what it was he was required to do, so that he had the means of considering whether or not he should comply, and it must be shown by evidence that there was a distinct demand of that which the party seeking the mandamus desires to enforce, and that that demand was met by a refusal.’

25. In the cases before us there was no such demand or refusal. Thus, no ground



whatsoever is shown here for the issue of any writ, order, or direction under Article 226 of the Constitution.”

As such, petition stands disposed of on the following terms:-

(a) Petitioner shall approach, respondent No.2, namely, the Bihar Medical Services and Infrastructure Corporation Limited through its Managing Director within a period of four weeks from today by filing a representation for redressal of the grievance(s);

(b) The authority concerned shall consider and dispose it of expeditiously by a reasoned and speaking order preferably within a period of three months from the date of its filing along with a copy of this order;

(c) The order assigning reasons shall be communicated to the petitioner;

(d) Needless to add, while considering such representation, principles of natural justice shall be followed and due opportunity of hearing afforded to the parties;

(e) Also, opportunity to place on record all relevant materials/documents shall be granted to the parties;

(f) Equally, liberty is reserved to the petitioner to take recourse to such alternative remedies as are otherwise available in accordance with law;



(g) We are hopeful that as and when petitioner takes recourse to such remedies, as are otherwise available in law, before the appropriate forum, the same shall be dealt with, in accordance with law and with reasonable dispatch;

(h) Liberty reserved to the petitioner to approach the appropriate forum/Court, should the need so arise subsequently on the same and subsequent cause of action;

(i) We have not expressed any opinion on merits.
All issues are left open;

(j) The proceedings, during the time of current Pandemic- Covid-19 shall be conducted through digital mode, unless the parties otherwise mutually agree to meet in person i.e. physical mode;

The petition stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

Interlocutory Application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(Sanjay Karol, CJ)

(S. Kumar, J)

Ashwini/Sujit

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	30.07.2022
Transmission Date	NA

