

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.15263 of 2022

=====

Anil Kumar Prasad, son of Virendra Kumar Prasad, Residing at-Orma Uttar Tola, P.O.-Haakam, P.S.-Siwan (M), District-Siwan-844126, Address as per Adhar Card Resident of -27-C, Pocket A1 LIG Flat Mayur Vihar, Phase-3, Vasundhara Enclave, ASO East, Delhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Works Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Engineer-in-Chief, Rural Works Department, Bihar, BRRDA, 3rd Floor, Land Development Bank Building, Budh Marg, Patna, Bihar 800 001.
3. The Chief Engineer, Rural Works Department, Patna.
4. The Superintending Engineer, Work Circle, Rural Works Department, Siwan.
5. The Executive Engineer, Rural Works Department, Work Division, Siwan-2.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ranjeet Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Kumar Alok (SC7)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

3 05-12-2022 The petitioner has prayed for the following relief/s :-

“i. For setting aside the decision of the Technical Tender Committee dated 29.07.2022, issued with the signature of the Engineer-in-Chief, Rural Works Department, Bihar, Patna, to the extent it relates to the petitioner whereby the petitioner has been declared ineligible in terms of clause 4.2 (g) of the MBD in the NIT No. MR- 3054-13/2022-23; Package No.- MR N/22-23, Siwan 2/01 (Tender ID- 2022-ECBIH- 118881-1).

ii. For setting aside the subsequent order



dated 16.09.2022, issued by the Technical Bid Committee whereby the Technical Committee without considering the specific objection of the petitioner reiterated its earlier decision to disqualify the petitioner in technical tender for not fulfillment clause 4.2 (g) of the MBD as well as for pendency of the ATR with respect to construction of one road in terms of clause 4.7 (ii) of the MBD.

iii. The petitioner further prays that after setting aside the aforementioned decision of the technical bid committee, the petitioner be declared eligible and thereafter the respondent be directed to consider the case of the petitioner in the financial bid and award the contract if he is declared L1.

iv. For any other relief/reliefs for which the petitioner may be deemed entitled to.

Mr. Ranjeet Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner states that in view of the intervening developments, petitioner does not want to press the present petition.

As such, the present petition stands disposed of as not pressed.

Interlocutory application, if any, stands disposed of.

(Sanjay Karol, CJ)

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Ashwini/DKS

U			
---	--	--	--

