

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.13425 of 2025

=====

Skylight Engineering and Construction Proprietor Mukesh Kumar, Gender- Male, aged about- 33 years, Son of Rameshwar Prasad Gupta, Resident of Flat No.- 3A, Sushila Residency, Near Shiv Mandir, West Lohanipur, P.S.- Kadamkuan, District and Town- Patna, Pin- 800003.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Old Secretariat, Patna.
2. The Infrastructure Development Authority, (A Government of Bihar Undertaking) through its Chairman-cum- Chief Secretary, 1st Floor, Udhog Bhawan, East of Gandhi Maidan, Patna- 800004.
3. The Managing Director, the Infrastructure Development Authority, (A Government of Bihar Undertaking), 1st Floor, Udhog Bhawan, East of Gandhi Maidan, Patna- 800004.
4. The Director (Program Implementation), the Infrastructure Development Authority, (A Government of Bihar Undertaking), 1st Floor, Udhog Bhawan, East of Gandhi Maidan, Patna- 800004.
5. The Director, (Finance), the Infrastructure Development Authority, (A Government of Bihar Undertaking), 1st Floor, Udhog Bhawan, East of Gandhi Maidan, Patna- 800004.
6. The Executive Engineer (Tech.), the Infrastructure Development Authority, (A Government of Bihar Undertaking), 1st Floor, Udhog Bhawan, East of Gandhi Maidan, Patna- 800004.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Lal Babu Singh, Advocate
For the IDA	:	Ms. Pallavi Pandey, Advocate
For the State	:	Mrs. Vagisha Pragma, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAILENDRA SINGH
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH)

5 29-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. Following is the relief sought for in the present writ
application:-



“1. That, the Petitioner seek indulgence of this Hon’ble Court for the following relief(s):

(i) For quashing of the Letter No. 2264/PDA dated 26.04.2024 (Annexure-P/8) of the Respondent No. - 4, the Director (Program Implementation), whereby and whereunder the Petitioner has been debarred from participating in the future tenders.

(ii) For appropriate declarations that :-

a) The impugned order of debarment of the Petitioner dated 26.04.2024 is without jurisdiction as the Respondent No.-4, the Director (Program Implementation) is not the competent authority.

b) The impugned order of debarment of the Petitioner dated 26.04.2024 contained in Letter No. 2264/PDA is violative of principles of natural justice and fair play as no notice was given to the Petitioner as to debarment by the competent authority.

c) The ground of debarment of Petitioner is contrary to actual fact and in any case the Petitioner cannot be held liable for delay in the execution of the construction work of “Construction of Investors Facilitation Centre at Industrial Area, New Bihta, Patna”.

d) The debarment of a contractor cannot be for indefinite period.

(iii) For any other relief(s) of consequential relief(s) to which the Petitioner may be found entitled to in the facts and circumstances of this case.”

3. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that



the petitioner has approached this Court challenging the order of the debarment. During the pendency of the present writ application, the order of cancellation of the work order has already been passed. Therefore, the debarment order stands merged with the subsequent order of cancellation of work order.

4. In such circumstances, this Court is of the view that no further order is required to be passed in the present application as the impugned order no longer survives for consideration.

5. Accordingly, the present writ application stands disposed of.

6. If so advised, the petitioner shall be at liberty to challenge the order of cancellation of the work order before the appropriate forum, in accordance with law.

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

(Sudhir Singh, J)

(Shailendra Singh, J)

Sachin/-

U			
---	--	--	--

