

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9879 of 2025

=====

M/s Raja Constructions through its Managing Partner Shyamdeo Singh,
Gender-Male, aged about -42 years, Son of Dwarika Singh, Resident of Taj
Colony, Panchayati Akhara, P.S.-Town, District-Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Road Construction Department, Visheweshraiya Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Road Construction Department, Visheweshraiya Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
3. The Engineer in Cheif (Works Management), Road Construction Department, Visheweshraiya Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
4. The Engineer in Chief (Head Quarters), Road Construction Department, Visheweshraiya Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
5. The Chief Engineer (South), Road Construction Department, Visheweshraiya Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
6. The Superintending Engineer, Road Construction Department, Magadh Road Circle, Gaya.
7. The Executive Engineer, Road Construction Department, Road Division-1, Gaya.

... .. Respondent/s

with

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 10033 of 2025

=====

M/s Raja Constructions through its Managing Partner Shyamdeo Singh,
Gender-Male, aged about 42 years, Son of Dwarika Singh, Resident of Taj
Colony, Panchayati Akhara, P.S.-Town, District-Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Road Construction Department, Visheweshraiya Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Road Construction Department, Visheweshraiya Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
3. The Engineer in Chief (Works Management), Road Construction Department, Visheweshraiya Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
4. The Engineer in Chief (Head Quarter), Road Construction Department, Visheweshraiya Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
5. The Chief Engineer (South), Road Construction Department, Visheweshraiya Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
6. The Superintending Engineer, Road Construction Department, Magadh Road Circle, Gaya.



7. The Executive Engineer, Road Construction Department, Road Division-1, Gaya.

... .. Respondent/s

with
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 10034 of 2025

M/s Raja Construction, through its Managing Partner Shyamdeo Singh, Gender-Male, aged about 42 years, Son of Dwarika Singh, Resident of Taj Colony, Panchayati Akhara, P.S. - Town, District - Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Road Construction Department, Visheweshraiya Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Road Construction Department, Visheweshraiya Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
3. The Engineer-in-Chief (Works Management), Road Construction Department, Visheweshraiya Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
4. The Engineer-in-Chief (Head Quarter), Road Construction Department, Visheweshraiya Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
5. The Chief Engineer (South), Road Construction Department, Visheweshraiya Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
6. The Superintending Engineer, Road Construction Department, Magadh Road Circle, Gaya.
7. The Executive Engineer, Road Construction Department, Road Division - 1, Gaya.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Jitendra Singh, Sr. Advocate Mr. Anil Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Nadeem Seraj, Advocate Mr. Madanjeet Kumar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE)

3 01-07-2025 We have heard Mr. Jitendra Singh, the learned

Senior Advocate for the petitioners in all the writ petitions



and Mr. Nadeem Seraj and Mr. Madanjeet Kumar, the learned Advocates for the State.

2. In all the writ petitions, the order of blacklisting has been challenged on the sole ground that the notice to the petitioners was vague and despite their seeking clarification, they were subjected to the order of blacklisting for ten years.

3. The contention on behalf of the writ petitioners is that in the absence of a clearly worded notice with respect to the anomalies found, it would have been absolutely difficult for them to respond.

4. That apart, when clarification was sought, instead of the respondents acting upon it, blacklisted the petitioners for a very long period (ten years).

5. Last of the contentions raised on behalf of the petitioners is that blacklisting, which is almost a civil death of a company, ought not to be for a long period as it would completely decapitate a party, which position cannot be salvaged.

6. Times without number, the Supreme Court has clarified that blacklisting for such a long period ought not to



be resorted to. Proportionality, though is a question of fact, but in the present set of circumstances when the petitioners were not under a clear notice or at-least a notice which could have been responded without further clarification, blacklisting for ten years is too harsh.

7. Considering these aspects of the matter, we deem it appropriate to set aside the order of blacklisting of the petitioners but with a caveat, noted below.

8. The petitioners shall be issued notice in clear words with respect to the anomalies found by the respondents. After the petitioners have responded to such notice, their replies shall be taken into account and a reasoned order shall be passed.

9. The process shall be completed within a period of six weeks, to be counted from today.

10. All the writ petitions stand disposed off accordingly.

(Ashutosh Kumar, ACJ)

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Rajesh/Saurabh

U			
---	--	--	--

