

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.12364 of 2017

=====

Ranjit Kumar Raut, S/o Ram Gulam Raut, resident of Village- Bheja, P.S.-
Bheja, District- Madhubani.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Education Department,
Patna, Bihar
2. Collector, Madhubani.
3. Deputy Development Commissioner, Madhubani.
4. Mid-Day Meal Yojana Samiti through its District Programme Officer,
Madhubani.
5. The District Programme Office, Mid-Day Meal Yojana Samiti, Madhubani.
6. Sanatan Kumar Singh, S/o not known, resident of Village-Nawani, P.S.
Jhanjharpur(Araria Sangram Unti),, District- Madhubani.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Shankar Kumar Thakur, Adcoate Mr. Shankar Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Smt. Binita Singh, SC-28
For the MDM	:	Mr. Girijish Kumar, Advocate Mr. Akash Anand, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR SINHA

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 14-11-2025

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
counsel appearing for the Mid Day Meal and learned counsel for
the respondent-State.



2. The petitioner in the present writ application has prayed for the grant of following relief(s):-

“(i) For quashing the letter contained in no. 1223 dated 19.10.2016 issued by the respondent no. 5 whereby and whereunder the respondent no. 6 has been selected for supply of mid-day meal to the school after lifting the food from the concerned godown by the respondent no. 5 for arbitrary manner as well as for extraneous consideration and also without following the norms contained in the tender invitation notice and the signature of the petitioner has been sent to the godown for the purpose of lifting of foodgrains.

(ii) For direction to the respondent no. 5 to issue work order in favour of the petitioner as the petitioner was a successful candidate for allotment of work order but the respondent no. 5 has arbitrarily rejected the application of the petitioner deliberately and maliciously showing that the tax token of two vehicle of the petitioner are failed.

The petitioner further prays for issuance of a writ/writs, order/orders, direction/directions for following relief/reliefs for which the petitioner is entitled in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner fairly submits that after the lapse of almost 8 years the cause which was being agitated in the writ application does not survive any more and hence he prays that accordingly the writ application be disposed of.



4. As prayed for by learned counsel for the petitioner, the writ application is disposed of because the cause does not survive any more.

5. Interlocutory Application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

(Alok Kumar Sinha, J)

P.K.P./-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	17.11.2025
Transmission Date	

