

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 2244 of 2023

=====

Ganesh Kumar, Son of Devbali Rai, Resident of Main Road Bypass, Near Akarsh Bajaj, East Saristabad, Phulwari, P.S.- Phulwari, District- Patna, PIN- 800002.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through its, Additional Chief Secretary-cum- Principal Secretary-cum- Mines Commissioner, Mines and Geology Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Additional Secretary-cum- Special Secretary, Mines and Geology Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director (Headquarter), Mines and 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.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sudhir Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Gyan Prakash Ojha, GA- 7
		Mr. Sangmitra Ghose, AC to 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 petitioner and the learned Spl. P.P. for the Mines.

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



in question, has also been issued in its 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 petitioner submits that though in earlier round of the tender, the petitioner 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 his 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 petitioner has other remedy available under the law and he 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			
---	--	--	--

