

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16333 of 2016

Rasto Pharmaceuticals son of Sri Manilal Rastogi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar and Ors
2. The Principal Secretary, Animal and Fisheries Resources Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, Animal and Fisheries Resources Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Senior Incharge Officer, Planning, Animal and Fisheries Resources Department, Govt. of Bihar, P
5. The District Animal Husbandry Officer, Bhojpur at Ara, District- Bhojpur at Ara.
6. The Mobile Animal Husbandry Officer- cum- Store Incharge, Office of District Animal Husbandry Offic

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : None
For the Respondent : Md. Khurshid Alam-Aag12

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. B. BAJANTHRI
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A. ABHISHEK REDDY
ORAL ORDER

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

3 16-05-2023 None appears for the petitioner.

2. The petitioner has prayed for the following reliefs:-

“(I) For issuance of an appropriate writ in the nature of CERTIORARI for quashing the Notice Inviting Tender for purchase of medicine published in the daily Hindi News Paper Dainik Jagaran on 10.08.2016 published under the authority of Respondent no. 5 pursuant to his memo no. 5074 dated



09.08.2016 on the ground that pursuant to the said tender notice the petitioner firm had also sent his tender document through Indian Post on 26.08.2016 and the same was delivered in the office of Respondent no. 5 on 29.08.2016 but the Respondent no. 5 returned back the same through courier which was received by the petitioner on 20.09.2016 through courier without its opening.

(II) For issuance of an appropriate writ in thenature of MANDAMUS, commanding and directing the Respondent Authorities to re-advertise the said Notice Inviting Tender and entertain the tender document of the petitioner, if the petitioner submitted his tender document pursuant to that tender.

(III) For issuance of an appropriate writ in the nature of MANDAMUS, to restrain the Respondents to issue any purchase order if pursuant to the impugned notice inviting tender any tenderer was selected.

(IV) For issuance of any other appropriate writ/writs, order/ orders, direction/ directions for which the writ petitioner would be found entitled under the facts and circumstances of the case.”

3. Perusal of the record, it is evident that there is no interim order. On the other hand, learned counsel for the



respondents on instruction submitted that the subject matter of impugned notification has already spent its force during the pendency of the present petition.

4. Accordingly, the present petition stands disposed of as it has become infructuous.

(P. B. Bajanthri, J)

(A. Abhishek Reddy , J)

gaurav/abhishek-

U			
---	--	--	--

