

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11157 of 2024

=====

Anil Kumar Prasad Son of Virendra Kumar Prasad, Residing at -Orma Uttar Tola, P.O.- Haakam, P.S. Siwan (M), District- Siwan- 844126, Address as per Aadhar Card , Resident of- 27C, Pocket A1 LIG Flat Mayur Vihar, Phase-3, Vasundhara Enclave, ASO East Delhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Planning and Development Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Planning and Development Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Chief Engineer, Local Area Engineering Organizaton, Patna (Planning and Development Department), Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Superintending Engineer, Local Area Engineering Organization, Work Circle, Chapra, Saran.
5. The Executive Engineer, Local Area Engineering Organization, Work Division 01, Siwan.
6. The Executive Engineer, Bihar State Education Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Shiksha Bhawan, Bihar, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ranjeet Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Dr. K. N. Singh, ASG
		Mr. Anshuman Singh, CGST
		Mr. Shivaditya Dhari Sinha, AC to ASG
		Mr. Devansh Shankar Singh, AC to ASG
For the BSEIDC	:	Mr. Girjish Kumar, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NANI TAGIA

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date : 26-07-2024

Heard learned counsels for the parties.

2. The petitioner before us, relying on Annexure-P/4

which he has submitted before the Tendering Authority, contends

that it is a completion certificate. However, the Tendering



Authority has disqualified the petitioner on the ground that it is not a completed work and it is an ongoing work.

3. At the admission stage itself, learned Assisting Counsel to the Additional Advocate General on behalf of the respondents points out that the details are totally absent in the Annexure-P/4. Annexure-P/4 does not show the person who has been given the work or who has completed it. Though it certifies that the work was completed and handed over, the place where the dates are to be filled up is left blank. The reliance placed on this document is the foundation of the writ petition, which we find to be misconceived.

4. In such circumstances, we see absolutely no reason to entertain this writ petition.

5. Accordingly, this writ petition stands dismissed *in limine*.

(K. Vinod Chandran, CJ)

(Nani Tagia, J)

Nishant/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	29.07.2024
Transmission Date	NA

