

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.14422 of 2015

=====

M/s Brijnandan Singh, through its Partner Brijnandan Singh, son of Late Mangroo Singh, Resident of Village Lahthan, P.S. Agiaon Bazar, District Ara Bhojpur Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna
2. The Secretary, Water Resources Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Engineer in Chief Central Water Resources Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Chief Engineer Water Resources Department, Dehri , District Sararam, Bihar
5. The Superintending Engineer, Planning and Monetoring, Circle 3, Water Resources Department, Government of Bihar, Patna
6. Garima Constracts Pvt. Ltd. Ramgarh, District – Kaimur, Bihar
7. Darshita Builders Developers Pvt. Ltd., Ramgarh, District – Kaimur, Bihar

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Prabhat Ranjan, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Md. Raisul Haque, Advocate
For Resp. Nos. 6 & 7	:	Mr. Ashish Giri, Advocate
		Mr. Sumit Kr. Jha, Advocate
		Ms. Riya Giri, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. B. BAJANTHRI
and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR JHA
ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. B. BAJANTHRI)

Date : 12-05-2023

Heard learned counsels for the respective parties.

2. In the instant petition, petitioner has prayed for the following relief/reliefs:

“(i) Quashing of the proceedings/ decision
of the Departmental Tender Committee dated
12.08.2015 as contained in Memo No. 1271 (Annexure



3) by which the Technical Bid of the petitioner has been rejected and action Under Clause 3.3 and 4.8 of Instruction to Bidders under the Standard Bidding Document has been contemplated.

(ii) Direction upon the respondents to consider the financial bid of the petitioner after declaring him successful in the Technical Bid;

(iii) Restraining the petitioner from finalizing the tender and creating third party rights during the pendency of the present writ petition.”

3. Petitioner had the benefit of interim order on 18.09.2015. Thereafter, it was vacated on 10.02.2016 at the behest of respondent No. 7. In view of these facts and circumstances and the fact that 7th respondent must have executed the subject work, therefore, the present petition does not survive for consideration.

4. Accordingly, writ petition stands dismissed as infructuous.

(P. B. Bajanthri, J)

(Arun Kumar Jha, J)

GAURAV S./-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	17.05.2023
Transmission Date	NA

