

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3072 of 2025

=====

Anand Mishra S/o Umesh Mishra, Resident of Village Ramdas Bagahi, P.O.-
Bagahi Bazar, P.S.- Kateya, District- Gopalganj.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. Local Area Engineering Organization, Bihar at Patna through its Chief Engineer.
3. The Executive Engineer, Local Area Engineering Organization, Bihar at Patna.
4. The Superintending Engineer, Local Area Engineering Organization, Bihar at Patna.
5. The Executive Engineer, Local Area Engineering Organization, Gopalganj Bihar.
6. Sanjay Kumar Singh, Presently the Chief Engineer, Local Area Engineering Organization, Bihar at Visvesvaraya Bhawan, Patna.
7. Renu Devi, W/o Not Known, R/o Mhavir Mandir Road, Nepali Nagar, Ashiyana, Patna PIN Code- 800025.
8. The District Magistrate, Gopalganj.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Ms. Abhilasha Jha, Advocate Mr.Kumar Harshvardhan, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr.Vikas Kumar, AC to A.G.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL JUDGMENT
(Per: HONOURABLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date : 13-05-2025

Heard Ms. Abhilasha Jha, learned Advocate for
the petitioner and Mr. Vikas Kumar, learned Advocate for
the State.

2. The petitioner and Respondent No. 7 had



participated in the bid floated by the concerned authority for construction of *Panchayat Bhawan*.

3. It appears that both the petitioner and Respondent No. 7 were declared to be technically responsive. However, the petitioner doubted the credentials of Respondent No. 7 and raised an objection about her having been wrongly declared to be technically responsive.

4. The complaint by the petitioner was placed before the Committee, which re-evaluated the bids of the petitioner and Respondent No. 7; made a comparison in a tabular form and found that both the petitioner and Respondent No. 7 were technically responsive.

5. The writ petition does not state whether the financial bids were opened.

6. The petitioner is not listed below Respondent no. 7; rather both of them have been found to be technically responsive.

7. We have not been able to understand as to why such an objection has been raised by the petitioner.

8. In any view of the matter, Ms. Jha has submitted that when the complaint of the petitioner was



being considered, the petitioner should have been heard.

9. We find such objection to be untenable for the reason that the entire objection of the petitioner was placed before the Committee, which not only re-evaluated the decision with respect to Respondent No. 7 but also the petitioner and found that both of them were technically responsive.

10. In that view of the matter, we find no ground for us to interfere with the decision of the Committee holding both the petitioner and respondent no. 7 to be technically responsive.

11. The writ petition stands dismissed.

(Ashutosh Kumar, ACJ)

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Sujit/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	14.05.2025
Transmission Date	NA

