

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1336 of 2024

=====

Branzo Projects Pvt. Ltd Through its Director, Brijesh Kumar (Male) aged about 46 years, S/o Ramashray Prasad, Resident of Chauriya Tola, Dhumnagar, Ward No. 15, P.O. Dhumnagar, P.S. Jagdishpur, District- West Champaran (Bihar) 845438.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Secretary, Rural Work Department, Government of Bihar.
2. The Secretary, Rural Works Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Engineer-in-Chief, Rural Works Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Chief Engineer, Rural Works Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
5. The Chief Engineer-2, Rural Works Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
6. The Superintending Engineer, Rural Works Department, Works Circle- Munger.
7. The Executive Engineer, Rural Works Department, Works Division, Kharagpur, Tarapur, District- Munger.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Satish Kumar Giri, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Anjani Kumar, AAG-4
		Mr. Alok Kumar Rahi, AC to AAG-4

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL JUDGMENT
(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date : 26-04-2024

The petitioner is aggrieved with the fact that his tender has been rejected as per Annexure-P/2. For the very same reason the Engineer-in-Chief had not rejected another tender is the contention, which is argued from Annexure-P/4.

2. Insofar as the petitioner is concerned, the rejection was on account of the details of the key personnel



having been wrongly submitted.

3. What is argued on the basis of Annexure-P/4, is that the Engineer-in-Chief has found that one Engineer can work with different contractors. We do not think that there is any identity of allegation, as raised in Annexure-P/4 and Annexure-P/2. In Annexure-P/2 the specific ground raised is that the details of key personnel have been wrongly submitted. We also see that the bidder who raised the objection has not been impleaded.

4. The learned Additional Advocate General submits that the contract has already been awarded; which successful bidder also is not impleaded.

5. For all the above reasons, we find no cause to entertain the writ petition and dismiss the same.

(K. Vinod Chandran, CJ)

(Harish Kumar, J)

uday/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	26.04.2024
Transmission Date	NA

