

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6665 of 2026

Chandra Kant Son of Ramakant Priyadarshi, Resident of Village - Dhamauli
Bigha, P.O. - Wena, P.S. Wena, District- Nalanda.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Through the Principal Secretary, Urban Development and Housing Department, Government of Bihar, Patna (Bihar).
2. The Divisional Commissioner, Patna Division, Patna (Bihar).
3. The District Magistrate-cum-Collector, District- Nalanda (Bihar).
4. The Additional Collector, District- Nalanda, (Bihar).
5. The Sub Divisional Officer, Rajgir, District- Nalanda (Bihar).
6. The Deputy Collector Land Reforms, Rajgir, District- Nalanda (Bihar).
7. The Executive Officer, Nagar Parishad, Rajgir, District- Nalanda (Bihar).
8. Ashok Roy, Male Son of Late Suresh Yadav, Resident of Thilha Pet, Near Bus Stand, P.O. and P.S. Rajgir, District- Nalanda.
9. Sanjay Singh Son of Late Nageshwar Singh, Resident of Diamond Hotel, P.O. and P.S.- Rajgir, District- Nalanda.
10. Pradeep Kumar Son of not known, Resident of Chhabilapur Road, Near Hotel Gargi Grand, P.O. and P.S.- Chhabilapur, District - Nalanda.
11. Dhananjay Singh @ Soni Singh Son of Late Ramashish Singh, Resident of Village- Chakpar Rajgir, P.O. and P.S.- Rajgir, District- Nalanda.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Raju Giri, Advocate with Mr. Harsh Vardhan, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Rajesh Kumar, AC to GP 3
For the Resp. No.7	:	Mr. Rajeev Ranjan Kr. Pandey, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 12-05-2026 Heard the parties.

2. The present writ petition has been preferred for
grant of following reliefs:

*“i. for commanding the
respondents to produce the Settlement
Order of Rajgir Malmas Mela, Sairat done*



in favour of Respondent Nos. 8 to 11 on 06.04.2026 through open bid and then to issue a writ of Certiorari for quashing the said settlement.

ii. for commanding the respondents to again hold a fresh bid for settlement of Rajgir Malmas Mela, Sairat in terms of the Government Circular issued vide letter No. 2526 dated 12.09.1978 and by also allowing the petitioner to participate in the fresh bid.

iii. to any other relief or reliefs for which the petitioner is entitled.”

3. The matter relates to **Rajgir Malmas Mela**, Sairat and this year it will be taking place between **17.05.2026** to **15.06.2026**.

4. The admitted fact is that the petitioner did not participate in the bidding process pursuant to the settlement notice issued by the **Nagar Parishad, Rajgir** under the signature of its **Executive Officer** dated **16.03.2026** and the amount recorded in the said notice is/was Rs. **7,30,25,000/-**.

5. Pursuant thereto, bid took place on **06.04.2026** and it is the case of the petitioner that six bidders participated and after slight increase of Rs. **2,16,000/-**, the bid was allowed in favour of the respondent nos. 8 to 11 for Rs. **7,32,41,000/-**.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



though he was a non-participant, he offered the higher bid amount of Rs. **8,32,00,000/-** by way of representation on 10.04.2026.

7. On 10.04.2026, though not part of the writ petition, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it may be recorded that he has not been blacklisted anywhere in the State of Bihar and as such not only he is entitled to represent, is also otherwise eligible to offer the bid amount.

8. Learned counsel for the petitioner has drawn the attention of this Court to paragraph 14 of the writ petition to show that now he has increased his bid amount to **Rs. 9,15,51,250/-**.

9. The submission is that the aforesaid process that has been undertaken by the respondents to help the respondent nos. 8 to 11 by increasing the bid only by Rs. 2,16,000/-. He has taken this Court to the **Government Circular** dated **12th September, 1978** to show that in case of rebidding, the bidder needs to pay 25% excess of the bid amount which in this case is missing.

10. His further submission is that aggrieved by the said decision of Executive Officer, Nagar Parishad, Rajgir, the petitioner preferred petition which followed the **letter No. 351**



dated 20.04.2026 issued by the **Commissioner, Patna Division, Patna** and addressed to the **District Magistrate, Nalanda** asking for an inquiry into the matter and submit the inquiry report (Annexure P/7 to the writ petition).

11. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that nothing has happened thereafter and the 'Mela' time has come which shall start from 17.05.2026. He as such submits that the Settlement order be stayed till the reply comes on behalf of the respondents.

12. Learned State Counsel as also learned counsel representing Executive Officer, Nagar Parishad, Rajgir on the other hand opposes the prayer and jointly submits that the petitioner though chose neither to participate nor was there during rebidding but has now approached the Court with an offer to increase the bid amount. The submission is that this is being done only to stall the 'Mela' Settlement.

13. Further, though the learned counsel submits that the petitioner has not been blacklisted anywhere in the State of Bihar, the said statement is missing in the writ petition. The last submission is that the 'Malmas Mela' is to start from 17.05.2026 and any disturbance in the settlement will not only create financial loss to the Nagar Parishad, Rajgi, it will also affect the



petty shopkeeper.

14. The last submission is that beside the reply that they shall be filing, the respondent nos. 8 to 11 have to be noticed. As such, the matter be adjourned for allowing them to file reply.

15. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it would suffice that if his fresh representation before the Collector, Nalanda be taken note of and an appropriate order be passed.

16. In that background, with the consent of the parties, instead of keeping the case pending, this Court allows the petitioner to approach the Collector, Nalanda along with a fresh representation where all the parties including the **Nagar Parishad, Rajgir** and respondent nos. 8 to 11 be heard before a reasoned order is passed.

17. The writ petition is disposed of with the aforesaid observation.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Ranjeet/-

U			
---	--	--	--

