

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17494 of 2025

=====

M/s Rudra Enterprises Office at Belbanawa, Motihari, District East Champaran (Bihar) through its Partner Satyam Kumar, Male, aged about 47 years, Son of Surendra Pratap Singh, Resident of Ward No. 34, Raja Bazar, Gopalpur, P.S. Town Motihari, District East Champaran, Bihar.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Works Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Engineer In-Chief-cum Additional Commissioner-cum-Special Secretary, Rural Works Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Chief Engineer-5 (Muzaffarpur), Rural Works Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Superintending Engineer, Rural Works Department, Works Circle-Motihari, District East Champaran, Bihar.
5. The Executive Engineer, Rural Works Department, Works Division -Motihari, District East Champaran, Bihar.
6. M/s. SSS Construction, village Sita Kund, Bedi Ban, Madhuban, P.O.- Pipra, Via-Damodarpur, District East Champaran, Bihar 845416.

... .. Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Prabhat Ranjan, Advocate
For the Respondents : Mr. Amish Kumar, J.C. to A.G.

=====

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

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH)

2 20-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the respondents.

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

*“1 (i) Quashing of the decision of the
Technical Bid Evaluation Committee headed
by the Engineer-in-Chief as contained in*



Memo No. 2719 dated 24.09.2025 (Annexure-P/5) by which, the Committee, misinterpreting the interdict of Clause 32 of the NIT read with Clause 24.2 of the ITB has refused to entertain the objection filed by the petitioner and further re-affirmed the decision of qualification of Respondent No. 6;

(ii) Commanding the Respondents to re-evaluate the technical bid of the Respondent no. 6 in terms of the objection filed by the petitioner and the verification report obtained from the employees Provident Fund Organization reporting the Registration Certificate submitted by Respondent No. 6 to be forged and false; and

(iii) Restraining the Respondents from finalizing the tender and creating third-party rights during the pendency of the present writ application and/or the without the leave of this Hon'ble Court.

3. A counter affidavit has been filed on behalf of respondent nos. 1 to 5, wherein following statement has been made in paragraph no. 18:-

“18. That it would not be out of place to mention here that the tender in question has already arrived to its finality and the Letter of Acceptance bearing Letter No. 2423 dated



06.10.2025 has already been issued to the successful bidder and the process for execution of agreement has already been initiated.”

4. Considering the aforesaid statement, it appears that tender in question has already attained finality, thereby rendering the present writ application infructuous.

5. Accordingly, the present writ application stands disposed of as having become infructuous.

6. The petitioner, if so advised, shall be at liberty to challenge the Letter of Acceptance issued in favour of respondent no. 6 vide Letter No. 2423 dated 06.10.2025.

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

(Sudhir Singh, J)

(Shailendra Singh, J)

U.K./-B.K.S.

U			
---	--	--	--

