

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8106 of 2026

M/s A.M. Infratech having its registered office at Ward No. 7, Murligarhi, Renukoot, District Sonbhadra, Uttar Pradesh-231221 through its authorized representative and Power of Attorney Holder Bashisth Mishra, aged about 61 years (Male), Son of Jangbahadur Mishra, Resident of adhiwakta nagar, ward no. 14, P.O- Gopalganj, P.S.- Town Thana, District- Gopalganj, Bihar-841428.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Road Construction Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Secretary, Road Construction Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Engineer-in-Chief-cum-Additional Commissioner-cum-Special Secretary (Works Management), Road Construction Department, Bihar, Patna.
4. The Chief Engineer, North, Road Construction Department, Bihar, Patna.
5. The Superintending Engineer, Bettiah Road Circle, Bettiah.
6. The Executive Engineer, Road construction Department, Road Division, Bettiah.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Sourav Suman, Adv. Ms. Pragati Patra, Adv. Mr. Pranav Raj, Adv.
For the State	:	Md. Harun Quareshi, AC to SC-1

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MOHIT KUMAR SHAH
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MOHIT KUMAR SHAH)

2 25-06-2026 The present writ petition has been filed seeking the following reliefs:-

“1(i). For issuance of an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature of certiorari for quashing the impugned order contained in Letter No. 2415, dated 10.04.2026, passed by Respondent No.2, whereby the petitioner's representation has been rejected in an



arbitrary, mechanical and non-speaking manner.

(ii). For issuance of an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature of certiorari for quashing Technical Committee Report No. 513(E), dated 21.01.2026 and consequential proceedings dated 29.01.2026 communicated through Letter No. 674, dated 30.01.2026, whereby the petitioner has been declared non-qualified and the tender finalized in favour of a third party;

(iii). For issuance of an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature of Mandamus commanding the respondents to treat the petitioner's experience certificate as a Prime Contractor as satisfying Clause 4.5A(b) of the SBD and reconsider the petitioner's bid in accordance with law;

(iv). For issuance of an appropriate writ, order or direction declaring that the respondents acted in derogation of and in circumvention of the order dated 18.02.2026, passed in C.W.J.C. No. 2506 of 2026, rendering the purported compliance and hearing granted pursuant thereto illusory and unsustainable in law;

(v). For issuance of an appropriate writ, order or direction restraining the respondents from acting further on the basis of the impugned rejection and/or from proceeding to give effect to the tender decision in favour of third party, during pendency of the present writ;

(vi). For issuance of an appropriate writ, order or direction restraining the respondents from acting further on the basis of the impugned tender finalization and/or giving effect thereto during the pendency of the present



writ petition.”

2. At the outset, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that admittedly, the bid has been awarded to some other bidder vide order dated 30.01.2026, hence the present writ petition has been rendered infructuous, nonetheless the petitioner shall be participating in future bids on merits.
3. Accordingly, the present writ petition stands disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

(Mohit Kumar Shah, J)

(Raj Kumar, J)

Ajay/-

U			
---	--	--	--

