

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.5859 of 2016

=====

Beyas Yadav S/o Ram Naresh Yadav, resident of Village Bishnu Khalsa, P.O.-
Dumar Nrendra, V/a Bhore, P.S.- Bhore, District- Gopalganj.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Syndicate Bank through its Managing Director and C.E.O. Syndicate Bank, Head Office, Manipal, Bangalore-560002.
2. The Managing Director and C.E.O. Syndicate Bank, Head Office, Manipal, Bangalore-560002.
3. The Deputy General Manager, Syndicate Bank, Regional Office, 2nd Floor, Maurya Tower Dak Banglow Ro
4. The Assistant General Manager, Syndicate Bank, Regional Office, 2nd Floor, Maurya Tower Dak Banglow
5. The Chief Manager, Syndicate Bank, Regional Office, 2nd Floor, Maurya Tower Dak Banglow Raod, Patna
6. Sri Manoj Yadav, S/o Sri Suresh Yadav, resident of Village- Husepur Tole Khushial, Chhapara, P.O.- Husepur, Via- Bhore, P.S. Bhore, District- Gopalganj.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Suraj Narain Yadav
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Siddharth Harsh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. B. BAJANTHRI
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

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

3 02-05-2023 In the instant writ petition, petitioner has prayed for
the following relief(s):-

*“1. That this is an application for
issuance of a writ in the nature of Mandamus
and/or any other appropriate writ, order or
direction commanding upon the respondent
to open the branch of the Syndicate Bank at
Bhore in the District of Gopalganj in the
premises of the petitioner offered by him*



pursuant to the tender notice published in the daily news-paper Hindustan dated 25.12.2015 holding that the offer given by the respondent no. 6 and acceptance of the same by the respondent Bank is wholly illegal, arbitrary, malafide and against the terms of the advertisement.”

02. There is no interim order against Respondent No.6, insofar as acceptance of his bid. Therefore, the present petition does not survive for consideration.

03. Learned counsel for the Respondent-Bank, on instruction, submitted that 6th Respondent who is L-1 has already executed the work.

04. In the light of these facts and circumstances, the writ petition stand disposed of as it has become infructuous.

(P. B. Bajanthri, J)

(Arun Kumar Jha, J)

Ashish/-
himanshu/-

U			
---	--	--	--

