

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.19633 of 2015

=====

Dilip Kumar Ojha Son of Sri Talkeshwar Ojha Resident of village -
Sammanpura, P.O. Badrabad, Police Station Arwal, District - Arwal

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Urban Development & Housing, Government of Bihar, Patna
2. The Secretary, Department of Urban Development and Holding, Government of Bihar, Patna
3. The District Magistrate, Aurangabad
4. The Nagar Panchayat, Daud Nagar, Aurangabad through the Executive officer
5. The Chairman/Chief Counsellor, Nagar Panchayat, Daud Nagar, Aurangabad
6. The Executive Officer, Nagar Panchayat, Daud Nagar, Aurangabad

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Rajesh Mohan, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Rakesh Narayan Singh, Advocate
		Mr. Ajay Kr. Rastogi, AAG 10
		Mr. Ashutosh Ranjan Pandey, 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 : 05-05-2023

Heard learned counsels for the respective parties.

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

“That the present writ petition is being filed on behalf of the petitioner for issuance of a writ/writs, in the nature of writ of certiorari for quashing of condition being local registered works contractor of Nagar Parishad, Daud Nagar,



Aurangabad vide memo no. 183 dated 07.09.2015 (Annexure 5) and in consequence whereof the notice dated 27.11.2015 by which and whereunder the petitioner was declared unsuccessful placed at Sl. no. 2 in the list, issued by the Executive Officer, Daud Nagar (annexures – 5 & 4 respectively) and further for a direction/directions to include the petitioner in respect to Tender notice no. 01/2015-16 published in ‘Prabhat Khabar’ newspaper dated 01.09.2015 by the Nagar Panchayat, Daud Nagar, Aurangabad and for further relief/reliefs in the facts and circumstances of the case the petitioner may entitled too.”

3. Perusal of the records, it is evident that there in no interim order, therefore, the relief sought by the petitioner 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	05.05.2023
Transmission Date	NA

