

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1983 of 2026

M/s S. S. Enterprises Anwarpur Chowk, Hajipur- 844101, District Vaishali (Bihar) through its proprietor Mr. Pradip Kumar, age about 47 years, son of Surendra Singh, resident of Ward No. 30, Chakwara, Hajipur, District- Vaishali-844101

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Agricultural Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Agricultural Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director of Agriculture, Agricultural Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Director, Horticulture -cum- Mission Director, Bihar Horticulture Development Society, Patna (State Horticulture Mission), 2nd Floor, Krishi Bhawan, Mithapur, Patna-800001.
5. The Nodal Officer, Bihar Horticulture Society, 2nd Floor, Krishi Bhawan, Mithapur, Patna-800001.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Vikas Kumar, Advocate
	:	Mr. Aradhna Kumari, Advocate
	:	Mr. Akash Deep, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. P.K. Verma, AAG-3
	:	Mr. Sanjay Kumar Ghosarvey, AC to AAG-3

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH)

2 12-02-2026

Heard learned counsels for the parties.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for the



following reliefs:-

(i) For setting aside communication dated 08.01.2026 whereby and where-under it has been informed that petitioner has been disqualified during evaluation of Tender for Cover-I from Notice Inviting "empanelment and fixation of rate for supply of Honeybee Colony (Box + Hives) Honey Extractor Food Grade Container for FY 2025-26 in the State of Bihar" (Work in Question), for following reasons:-

4. No proof of office address is available.

5. Experience of Honey Extractor Bills/ invoices are without GST payments in Tax invoice.

6. Invoices are with Bank Statements are not matching.

(ii) For direction to the respondent authorities to declare the petitioner qualified in evaluation of Cover-I of aforesaid tender Thereafter, open his financial bid and empaneled him as a successful bidder in the work in question.

3. In course of arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that during the pendency of the present writ application, the tender in question has already been cancelled by the competent authority.

4. In view of the aforesaid submission, and considering that the tender itself no longer survives, no further order is required to be passed in the present writ application as the matter has become infructuous.

5. Accordingly, the present writ application stands



disposed of as having become infructuous.

6. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(Sudhir Singh, J)

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Suruchi/
Anushka/-

U			
---	--	--	--

