



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9506 of 2025

JMDMSC- PRKS (Joint Venture), having its registered office at Village-Khairhin, P.O. Pachpokhari, P.S. Baghaila, District-Rohtas, Sasaram, Bihar through its Authorized Signatory Sanjay Kumar, Male, aged about 49 Years, Son of Late Lal Bahadur Ray, Resident of Village-Khairhin, P.O. Pachpokhari, P.S. Baghaila District- Rohtas, Sasaram.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Works Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Engineer In-Chief, Rural Works Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Chief Engineer-2, Rural Works Department, (Gaya), Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Superintending Engineer, Work Circle-Sasaram, Rural Works Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
5. The Nodal Officer, MMGSUY Rural Works Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
6. The Executive Engineer, Rural Works Department, Works Division-Sasaram.

... .. Respondents

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Prabhat Ranjan
For the Respondents : Mr. Government Advocate-5

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

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH)

3 08-05-2026

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. In the present writ petition, the petitioner has
prayed for the following relief(s):-

"(i) Quashing of the decision of the Technical Bid Committee dated 13.05.2025 as contained in Memo No. 1707 (Annexure P/4) by which, without any jurisdiction and in extreme derogation of the judgment of this Hon'ble Court as also the Standard Bidding Document,





the Technical Bid of the petitioner has been held to be non-responsive in the course of reevaluation;

(ii) Direction upon the Respondents to consider and pass a reasoned / speaking order on the representation/ objection filed by the petitioner dated 20.05.2025 (Annexure P/5) bringing on record the grounds for challenge to the rejection of the Technical Bid of the petitioner and illegal acceptance of the Technical Bid of other Bidders; and

(iii) Restraining the respondents from proceedings further and finalizing the tender by creating a third party right during the pendency of the present writ application and/or the without the leave of this Hon'ble Court."

3. Learned counsel for the State submits that the work order has already been issued rendering the present application infructuous.

4. Considering the aforesaid statements, the present application stands disposed of as having become infructuous.

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

(Sudhir Singh, J.)

(Shailendra Singh, J.)

Gaurav Kumar/-

