

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6510 of 2024

=====

Gauri Shankar Yadav Son of Bucchi Yadav, Resident of Village- Pakohawa,
Dinmo, Ward No. 10, Block- Kusheshwar Asthan, District- Darbhanga.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Through the Principal Secretary, Rural Works Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Rural Works Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Engineer-in-Chief, Rural Works Department, Visheshwaraya Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
4. The Nodal Officer, PMGSY (Pradhan Mantri Gramin Sadak Yojana), Bihar, Patna.
5. The Chief Engineer, Rural Works Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
6. The Superintending Engineer, Rural Works Department, Work Circle, Darbhanga-cum- Chairman of Techincal Tender Disposal Committee, Darbhanga,
7. The Executive Engineer, Rural Works Department, Work Division, Biraul.
8. Sanjeev Kumar Jha, Son of not known to the petitioner, Resident of Village- Harauli, Ward No. 2, P.S.-Kusheshwar Asthan, District- Darbhanga.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shashi Bhushan Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Pratik Kumar Sinha, AC to GA-05

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE)



Date : 11-02-2025

We have heard Mr. Shashi Bhushan Singh, the learned Advocate for the petitioner and Mr. Pratik Kumar Sinha, the learned Advocate for the State.

2. The petitioner has expressed his grievance that despite respondent No. 8 having been debarred earlier by the Department, his tender papers were accepted and he was given the contract.

3. During the course of argument, it was pointed out by the learned counsel for the State that the petitioner himself was held to be technically unresponsive and, therefore, he would not be in a position to challenge the award of contract to respondent No. 8.

4. That apart, the State knew about the debarment of respondent No. 8 but despite such order, the entire work was executed by respondent No. 8 and was given the payments for the work done by him.

5. The other grounds raised on behalf of the petitioner is that the work allotted under the contract to respondent No. 8 is nearing completion.



6. Under such circumstances, no case has been made out by the petitioner for any interference.

7. The petition is dismissed.

8. Interlocutory application/s, if any, also stands disposed off accordingly.

(Ashutosh Kumar, ACJ)

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Manoj/Praveen-II

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	12.02.2025
Transmission Date	NA

