

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17698 of 2017

=====

Deepak Singh S/o late Harihar Singh R/o Village-Hasanpur, P.O.Mahisana,
P.S.- Lakhisarai Sadar, District- Lakhisarai.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Punjab National Bank Through Its Chairman and Ors
2. The Chief Manager, Divisional Officer Punjab National Bank, Biharsharif,
P.S. Town, District Naland
3. The Divisional Manager, Divisional officer, P.N.B, Biharsharif
Ramchandrapur, P.S. Town, District N
4. The Branch Manager, Punjab National Bank, Lakhisarai, P.S. Town, District-
Lakhisarai.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Rakesh Kumar, Adv.
	:	Mr. Chandan Kumar Kashyap, Adv.
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr.Kumar Priya Ranjan, Adv.
	:	Mr.Rajan Ghoshrawe, (Adv for PNB)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. G. ANUPAMA CHAKRAVARTHY

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 07-07-2025

1. The petitioner has prayed for the following
reliefs:

*(i) To issue a writ in the
nature of mandamus to direct the
respondents to consider this after of
the petitioner which was submitted in
connection with Tender Notification
made in the Daily News paper Dainik
Jagran in terms of the fact that
petitioner had offered lowest rate and
highest facilities by fulfilling act*



requirement as published in tender notification.

(ii) To hold and declare that the & act & process adopted by the respondent Bank is contrary to the terms as contemplated in the law arising out of Art.14 of Constitution of India & Contract Act. According the pleaded to cancel the settlement held between Respondent bank and Respondent No. 4 hereof.

(iii) To direct the respondent to accept the offer of the petitioner which was submitted through the consignment No. EF287116773IN received on 21.07.2017 at the office of Respondent No. 2.

(iv) To grant any other reliefs for which petitioner is entitled to have in connection with the aforesaid reliefs.

2. The brief facts, as culled out from the Writ petition, is that the petitioner made an application pursuant to a tender notification published in daily newspaper Dainik Jagaran, edition dated 15.06.2017 wherein tenders were invited from suitable candidates who could set up a constituted campus



and premises measuring between 1200 sq. ft. to 1600 sq. ft. As per the tender documents submitted by the petitioner, he stated that he has carpet area of 1448 sq. ft. including a parking area of 1114 sq. ft. situated at Lal Pahari, Ward No. 30, Kawaiya Police Station, Lakhisarai. The petitioner approached the Divisional Officer on 07.08.2017, where he was informed by one of the officers of the Bank, namely Jitendra Kumar Singh, that the consignment sent by the petitioner was received on 26.07.2017 whereas Post Office informed that it had been delivered on 21.07.2017. Subsequently, the petitioner came to know that he was not considered and that there had been a settlement between the respondent No. 4 and third parties. The petitioner also made a representation before Divisional Manager of Punjab National Bank, Bihar Sharif, enclosing all relevant documents. However, the bank adopted a pick-and-choose method and did not consider the application of the petitioner, for which the present Writ petition has been filed.



3. A detailed counter affidavit was filed by the respondent, Punjab National Bank, denying all the material allegations made in the Writ petition. The counter affidavit disclose that the advertisement was published in newspaper Danik Jagaran on 09.07.2017, inviting tenders from interested parties. Altogether 15 tenders were received by the respondent-Bank, out of which one tender was found to be invalid. However, 14 tenders, including that of the petitioner, were duly considered by the authorities. As per the guidelines contained in GSAD Circular No. 07/2016, dated 11.08.2017, a survey team was constituted by the competent authority and sent to inspect the sites for which valid tenders were received, including the site proposed by the petitioner. The Survey Committee submitted its report to the Building Committee of Bihar Sharif Circle of the respondent-Bank. As per the report, three proposals were shortlisted as technically suitable for the respondent-Bank, whereas the site of the petitioner was found technically unsuitable by the Building Committee. Thereafter, the financial offers



of only those applicants who were shortlisted were taken into consideration, and the tender was given to the applicant who quoted the lowest rate.

4. Heard the Learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the Learned counsel for the respondents.

5. On perusal of the record, the counter affidavit clearly discloses that the petitioner’s land was not as per the norms, and the Survey Committee had considered only three tenders out of the fourteen, and the lowest price among the three was finalized by the Bank. Therefore, this Court finds no error or irregularity in the order passed by the respondent-Bank.

6. With the aforesaid observations, the Writ petitions stands disposed of as it devoid of merits.

(G. Anupama Chakravarthy, J)

AMANDEEP/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	09.07.2025.
Transmission Date	

