

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8462 of 2019

=====

Rajdhar Kumar Yadav, Son of Sri Shani Lal Yadav, resident of Village-
Rustampur Belahi, P.S.- Laukahi, District- Madhubani.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Rural Works Department.
2. The Engineer In Chief, Rural Works Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Chief Engineer-3, Rural Works Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Superintending Engineer, Rural Works Department, Works Circle, Darbhanga.
5. The Executive Engineer, Rural Works Department, Works Division, Phulparas, District- Madhubani.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Suraj Narain Yadav, Advocate Mr. Arvind Kumar, Advocate Ms. Annu Shree, Advocate Ms. Pooja Shree, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mrs.Archana Meenakshee, GP -9

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL JUDGMENT
(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date : 11-10-2022

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

“ For issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari to quash the letter no. 260 dated 09.03.2019 issued by the Engineer In Chief, Rural Works Department, Government of Bihar, Patna so far the direction to cancel those tenders in which some of the contractors did not submitted required original documents and attempted to affect the tender process adversely and further for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus and or any



other appropriate writ, order or direction commanding the respondents to proceed with the tender process i.e. Financial bid and so on for construction of 1.183 KM road from BDR (Rohit Pandit Ke Khet) to Banka Bisanpur under Phulparas Works Division at Sl. No. 205 being Tender I.D. No. 69697 of NIT (No. RWD/MMGSY-07/2018-19/07).”

Having heard learned counsel for the parties, we are of the considered view that the petitioner has not made out a case for interference with the impugned order dated 09.03.2019(Annexure-4, Page 27).

There is nothing on record to establish that the petitioner had submitted the documents in original as per Notice Inviting Tender, which was essentially required to be submitted. It appears that a complaint was received against the functionary of the State, who was finalising tenders and awarding work without compliance of the mandatory conditions. It appears that the complaint was received by the Minister Incharge, who directed the authorities to examine the issue, prayed therein.

It is the result of such exercise, finding the petitioner not to have complied of the essential conditions of the NIT, the authorities have passed the impugned order dated 09.03.2019.

We notice that in the affidavit, respondents have



successfully have explained the entire process with which, we do not find any fault. Also, there is no rebuttal thereto.

As such, the present petition, in its present form, only merits rejection.

Interlocutory application, if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(Sanjay Karol, CJ)

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Sujit/Ashwini

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	12.10.2022
Transmission Date	

