

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16396 of 2017

=====

Jai Prakash Singh S/o Late Rajbansh Choudhary , R/o Village- Mujnoo, P.O.-
Sisirita, Residing at Mohalla- Santoshi Path 11B, Gorakshani, P.O.- Sasaram,
P.O.- Sasaram, District- Rohtas.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar and Ors
2. The Engineer In Chief, Rural Works Department , Govt. of Bihar,
Visheshwaraiya Bhawan, Patna.
3. The Chief Engineer-I, Rural Works Department, Vishweshwarraiya Bhawan,
Patna.
4. The Superintending Engineer, Sasaram Circle, Rural Works Department
Near Old Takiya Railway Gumti a
5. The Executive Engineer, Works Division-I, Rural Works Department, Jila
Parisad Campus, Sasaram, Roh

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	None
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr.P.N. Shahi -AAG-6
	:	Mr.Sanjeet Kumar Singh, AC to AAG-6

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. G. ANUPAMA CHAKRAVARTHY

ORAL ORDER

3 23-06-2025 1. This Court has passed a detailed oral
order on 17.06.2025 which reads as follows:-

“1. No representation for the petitioner.

2. The relief sought by the petitioner is to stay the operation of illegal office Letter No. 98 dated 14.02.2017, Letter No. 750 dated 07.11.2014 and Letter No. 562 dated 30.08.2013, whereby the petitioner was directed to complete the balance work under the works contract, otherwise the agreement will be rescinded and security deposit shall be forfeited for the liquidated damage of Rs. 15,07,209/-.

3. The Learned counsel for the respondent reported to the Court that the contract was rescinded as the petitioner failed to complete the



works. It was further submitted that the petition was filed in the year 2017 to quash the orders passed in the year 2013-2014, including Letter No. 98 dated 14.02.2017.

4. A detailed counter affidavit was also filed by the respondents which disclose that the agreement was rescinded on 30.08.2013 vide Letter No. 562. Further, the counter affidavit disclose that several opportunities were given to the petitioner, in spite of it, the petitioner did not pay any attention and having no other option left to the Executive Engineer, the agreement was rescinded.

5. For giving a fair opportunity to the petitioner, as a last indulgence, list on 23.06.2025."

2. In spite of giving a fair opportunity to the petitioner to make his submission as a last indulgence, today also, there is no representation for the petitioner.

3. Therefore, the writ petition is dismissed for default and for non-prosecution.

(G. Anupama Chakravarthy, J)

vinita/-

U			
---	--	--	--

