

MAT 615 of 2020
With
CAN 1 of 2020
With
CAN 2 of 2020

Sri Kaushik Paul
Vs.
Nabadiganta Industrial Township Authority & Ors.

Dr. Madhusudan Saha Ray
... .. for the respondent nos.1 to 7
Mr. Kaushik Chatterjee
... .. for the private respondents

None present for the appellant.

Learned counsel for the respondent nos.1 to 7 has pointed out that on account of subsequent development nothing survives in the appeal.

Perusal of the record reveals that the appeal was preferred by the writ petitioner against the interlocutory of the learned Single Judge dated 3rd September, 2020 passed in WPA 6231 of 2020 whereby learned Single Judge had refused to grant interim relief as against the issuance of the work order.

The record further reflects that in the writ petition appellant has challenged the rejection of tender and while passing the impugned order learned Single Judge had noted that the work order was already issued. After passing of the impugned order more than two years have passed.

Learned counsel for the respondent nos.1 to 7 has informed that the not only the work order was issued but now work has been executed and payment has been

made in favour of the party to whom the work order was issued.

Having regard to the aforesaid subsequent development, we are of the opinion that nothing survives in this appeal which is accordingly dismissed as infructuous.

Connected applications are accordingly dismissed.

(Prakash Shrivastava, C.J.)

(Rajarshi Bharadwaj, J.)