

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2227 of 2023

-
-
1. M/s R. P. Project, through its Proprietor Mr. Naveen Kumar, having its office at Gaya Road Bus Stand, Hisua, District- Nawada- 805103.
 2. Mr. Naveen Kumar, Son of Ramdeo Prasad Yadav, Resident of Hisua, Sartakia, District- Nawada- 805103.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through its, Additional Chief Secretary-cum-Principal Secretary-cum-Mines Commissioner, Mines & Geology Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Additional Secretary-cum-Special Secretary, Mines & Geology Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director (Headquarter), Mines & Geology Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Collector, Nalanda.
5. The Tender Committee, Nalanda, through its Chairman, Dy. Development Commissioner, Nalanda.
6. The Deputy Development Commissioner, Nalanda.
7. Mines Development Officer, Nalanda.
8. Assistant Director, Commercial Tax, Nalanda.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sudhir Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Gyan Prakash Ojha, GA- 7
For the Mines	:	Mr. Naresh Dikshit, Spl. P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 02-11-2023 Heard Mr. Sudhir Kumar Singh, learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned Spl. P.P. for the Mines.

2. At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that during the pendency of the present writ petition, re-tender has been convened and the Cluster-5, in question, has been awarded to one Manoj Kumar Maharathi, who has been held to be highest bidder. That apart, the letter of intent for the



Cluster, in question, has also been issued in his favour.

3. In view of the aforementioned subsequent development, the present matter appears to have become infructuous.

4. However, at this stage, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that though in earlier round of the tender, the petitioners having declared successful bidder, had deposited the security deposit, pursuant to the terms of tender, but the same has been returned after a delay of eleven months without any adequate interest upon the security deposit. He, thus, submits that now the grievance is confined to the interest over the security deposit, which was kept withheld for such a long period without any proper justification.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondents submits that the petitioners have other remedy available under the law and they can approach before the authority concerned, if so desire.

6. In view of the above, the present writ application stands disposed of, having become infructuous, with the liberty aforesaid.

(Harish Kumar, J)

uday/-

U			
---	--	--	--

