

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.15195 of 2025

Deo Enterprises Pvt. Ltd. having its registered office at Mohalla- Shiv Mandi, Gaushala Road, District- Khagaria through its Director Nand Kumar Yadav, male, aged about 59 years, Son of Punit Prasad Yadav, Resident of Chakhusaini Mansi, Ward no. 15, P.O. and P.S. - Chak Hussaini, District- Khagaria.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Additional Chief Secretary Rural works Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary Rural Works Department Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Engineer-in-chief-cum-Additional Commissioner-cum-Special Secretary, Rural Works Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Chief Engineer-4, Rural Works Department. Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
5. The Superintending Engineer Rural works Department, work Circle, Saharsa.
6. The Nodal Officer, State Yojna, Rural Works Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
7. The Executive Engineer, Work Division- Gogri District - Khagaria.
8. Mukesh Kumar Singh, S/o- Ramakant Singh, R/o- At Rajdhan P.O. and P.S.- Maheshkhunt, District- Khagaria, Pin - 851213.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Alok Ranjan, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. AC to AG
		Mr. Ravi Kumar, Advocate

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

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH)

5 22-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The following reliefs have been sought in the
present writ application:



" i). For quashing memo as contained in Memo no. 4969 dated 05.09.2025 issued under the signature of the Engineer-in-chief-cum-Additional Commissioner-cum-Special Secretary, Rural Works Department, Government of Bihar, Patna and other officials (Technical Bid Committee) uploaded on internet site of the Department, on 07.09.2025 Sunday after 12.50 PM as evident from digital signature after opening of Financial bid, whereby and where under the complaint filed on behalf of the respondent no. 8 has erroneously been rejected to favor him by the respondent authorities inspite of the fact that respondent no.8 have furnished wrong details (played fraud) about his ongoing commitments and have not furnished Bank guarantee in proper format which is mandatory requirement to be considered for award of work or to participate in the tender process.

ii). For quashing of the decision of the respondent authorities dated 07.09.2025 (Sunday) at about 12.48 PM, whereby and where under financial bid of the petitioner along with respondent no. 8 have been opened and respondent no. 8 has been declared as L1, in a very arbitrary, illegal, discriminatory manner, being biased as against the petitioner, without even informing to the petitioner about disposal of the complaint to the petitioner, moreover, the same was uploaded on the website after decision of the bid committee considering respondent no.8 as financially qualified.

iii). For directing and commanding the respondent authorities to award work order in favor of the petitioner as the petitioner possesses requisite criteria for grant of work (Tender ID-615420) (MGSY/24-25Gogari-01) and is duly qualified in technical and was erroneously declared as L2 and proceed further with the tender and get the agreement executed allow the petitioner to carry out and complete the work, for which petitioner possesses the requisite criteria.

iv). For declaration that the decisions of the authorities dated 04.09.2025 and 07.09.2025 uploaded on official website 12.50 PM and 12.48 PM respectively as totally baseless, illegal, arbitrary, discriminatory as against the petitioner, biased as against the petitioner, as well as colorable exercise of power.

v). For any other relief or reliefs for which the petitioner is entitled under law in the facts and circumstances of the present case."



3. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that during the pendency of the present writ application, a LOA has already been issued in favour of the Respondent No.8.

4. Considering the fact that the LOA (Letter of Acceptance) has already been issued which is not under challenge in the present writ application, this court is of the view that no further order is required to be passed in the present writ application.

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

6. If so advised, the petitioner shall be at liberty to challenge the said LOA by way of filing a separate writ application.

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

(Sudhir Singh, J)

(Shailendra Singh, J)

Rajiv/Sujit

U			
---	--	--	--

