

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17122 of 2025

=====

Brajdhari Kumar Son of Ramadhar Shukla Resident of village- Jalalpur, P.O.-
Jalalpur, P.S.- Jalalpur, District- Vaishali, Bihar- 844121.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Secretary, Public Health Engineering Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Secretary, Public Health Engineering Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Special Secretary, Public Health Engineering Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Engineer in Chief cum Special Secretary (HQ), Public Health Engineering Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
5. The Executive Engineer, Public Health Division, Hajipur, District- Vaishali.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Lalit Kishore, Senior Advocate
		Mr. Kanishka Shankar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Standing Counsel (28)

=====

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

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH)

2 10-02-2026 The present writ application has been filed for the

following reliefs:

*“i) For issuance of a writ in the
nature of certiorari for quashing the impugned
Office Order No. 86 contained in Memo No.
2301 dated 20/06/2023 (Annexure-P/03) issued
by the Respondent No. 5, the Executive
Engineer, Public Health Division, Hajipur,
wherein and whereby the Petitioner has been
debarred for an unspecified and indefinite*



period, which is in blatant violation of the Petitioner's fundamental and statutory rights.

ii) For issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the Show Cause Notice contained in Letter No. 2145 dated 07/06/2023 (Annexure-P/02) issued by the Respondent No. 5, which is manifestly arbitrary and illegal, as it fails to specify the alleged breach of any specific clause/term of the agreement or the proposed punishment, thereby denying the Petitioner a meaningful opportunity to be heard.

iii) For issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus for directing the Respondent authorities to forthwith delist and remove the Petitioner's name from the list of debarred contractors as published on its website.

iv) For any other relief or reliefs for which the Petitioner may be deemed entitled to in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

2. The petitioner had submitted a representation for redressal of grievance dated 08.09.2025 before respondent No. 5. However, the said representation is still pending consideration and no order has been passed till date.

3. Considering the nature of the grievance raised by the petitioner in the present writ application and the fact that



representation is still pending consideration, respondent No. 5 is directed to consider the same and pass an appropriate order, in accordance with law, after affording due opportunity of hearing to all the stakeholders, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt or production of a copy of this order.

4. The writ application is, accordingly, disposed of.

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

(Sudhir Singh, J)

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Anushka/-

U			
---	--	--	--

