



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

945 WRIT PETITION NO. 1817 OF 2024

SWAPNIL NAVNATH NAIKWADI AND ANOTHER

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS SECRETARY AND OTHERS

Mr.N.B. Jadhav, Advocate for the Petitioners.

Mr.P.K. Lakhotiya, AGP for the Respondent/State.

Mr.S.B. Ghute, Advocate for Respondent No.2.

CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE &
S.G. CHAPALGAONKAR, JJ.

DATED : 15.02.2024

PC :-

01. Petitioner No.1 is a Civil Contractor and Petitioner No.2 claims to be a Social Worker. Petitioner No.1 has a meagre experience of four years in construction of dams and carrying out repair work. Petitioner No.1 had competed with others by filing an E-tender. Petitioner No.1 is an L-2 bidder. There were six bidders. The grievance of the first Petitioner is that the tender was allotted to the Grampanchayat by overlooking the six bidders. The project for which the tender was floated has been completed.

02. The learned Advocate appearing on behalf of Respondent Nos.2 and 3 - Zilla Parishad submits on instructions that the project work has already been completed. The project has fructified. The Petition has been filed belatedly.

03. The ground raised by Petitioner No.1 is that if the work would have been allotted to him, valuable money of tax payers would have been saved.

04. Considering that the project has already been completed and the work is over, considering the law laid down in **M/s. N.G Projects Limited Vs. Vinod Kumar Jain & Ors., (2022) 6 SCC 127**, we do not find that any purpose would be served in entertaining this petition.

05. **This Petition is, therefore, dismissed.**

[S.G. CHAPALGAONKAR,J.]

[RAVINDRA V. GHUGE,J.]