

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3368 of 2024

=====

M/S Aryabhat Computers Head Office- 304 Lila and Gorakhnath Apartment
East Boring Canal Road, Patna-800 001, Bihar represented through its
Secretary, Nagendra Prasad Singh, Son of Late Aslok Singh, presently
residing at Flat No. 201, Saket Apartment, Montessori Lane, Boring Road,
Patna-800 001, District Patna, Bihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Represented through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Vigilance Department, Government of Bihar, Government of Bihar, Patna, 4th Floor Soochna Bhawan Sardar Patel Marg New Secretariat, Sardar Patel Smruti, Patna, Bihar 800015.
3. The Additional Chief Secretary, Finance Department, Government of Bihar, Patna, Main Secretariat, Patna- 800001.
4. The Additional Chief Secretary Education Department Government of Bihar Patna New Secretariat Vikash Bhawan Patna 800028.
5. The Joint Secretary Education Department Government of Bihar Patna New Secretariat Vikash Bhawan Patna 800028.
6. M/s Code Bucket Solutions Pvt. Ltd. represented through its Chief Operating Officer Mayank Raj, Registered Office at H. No. 497, Lalita Niwas, Nehru Nagar, Patna, Bihar.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Kumar Ravish, Advocate
Ms. Siddhi Asshana, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mrs. Binita Singh, Advocate

=====

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

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)



Date : 22-02-2024

The petitioner is before us claiming that the financial bid given by him has been enhanced by the tender committee, thus, rejecting his tender for that of the 6th respondent, who has quoted more.

2. The NIT was floated for the purpose of inviting tenders for operation of call centres, which included supply of personnel and also service of hardware and software.

3. The specific contention taken by the petitioner is with reference to Annexure-P/3 and P/4. While the petitioner has quoted unit rate of Rs. 600/-, the 6th respondent's quote is of Rs. 5000/-; is far higher. In the technical evaluation committee's report, the unit rate of the petitioner has been increased to Rs. 21,000/- without any basis, is the argument.

4. We have looked at Annexure-P/3, where the unit rate is Rs. 600/- and the quantity specified is 35 numbers. Hence, the same would come to 21,000/- for one unit. In fact, by Annexure-P/4, the 6th respondent quotes only Rs. 5000/- for one unit/quantity. The total quote for three months, as far as the petitioner is concerned, comes to Rs. 7,56,000/- while that of the 6th respondent comes to Rs. 1,80,000/-.

5. We find absolutely no reason to entertain the



writ petition. The writ petition stands dismissed.

(K. Vinod Chandran, CJ)

(Harish Kumar, J)

Sujit/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	23.02.2024
Transmission Date	

