



2026:CGHC:8769-DB

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPPIL No. 10 of 2026

Narendra Kumar Sahu S/o Shri Ishwar Sahu Aged About 41 Years R/o Baskar, Post- Badsara, Tahsil- Bhaiyathan, District- Surajpur (C.G.)

... Petitioner(s)

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Additional Secretary, Public Works Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Ata Nagar, Nawa Raipur, District- Raipur, (C.G.)

2 - The Chief Secretary Government Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur, District- Raipur (C.G.)

3 - The Engineer-In-Chief Public Works Department, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur, District- Raipur (C.G.)

4 - The Collector Surajpur, District- Surajpur (C.G.)

5 - The Executive Engineer Public Works Department, Bridge Construction Division, Bahupura, Jail Road, Ambikapur, District- Surguja (C.G.)

6 - M/s Agrico Steel Engineering Works "A" Class Contractor, Near Railway Station, Vishrampur, District - Surajpur (C.G.) Through Its Authorised Signatory.

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s) : Narendra Kumar Sahu in person

For Respondent(s) : Mr.Vivek Sharma, Advocate General with
Mr.Priyank Rathi, Government Advocate



Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Shri Ravindra Kumar Agrawal, Judge

Order on Board

Per Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

19.02.2026

1. Heard Narendra Kumar Sahu in person as well as Mr.Vivek Sharma, learned Advocate General with Mr.Priyank Rathi, learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondents/State.
2. By way of this writ petition (PIL), the petitioner has prayed for following reliefs:-

“10.1 That this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to issue an appropriate writ, thereby directing the respondent authorities for construction of High Level Bridge i.e. approach Road across Mahan River on Lanjit To Soubar Road as per work order was issued in favour of respondent no. 6 on 13.01.2026.

10.2 That, any other relief/order which may deem fit and just in the facts and circumstances of the case including award of the costs of the petition may be given.”

3. Facts of the case are that the villagers of Souhar and other nearby villages are facing great difficulties in carrying out their daily activities due to the lack of proper connectivity. Therefore, several requests and representations were made to the Government



authorities for the construction of a bridge over the Mahan River.

On the basis of the requests made by the affected villagers, Respondent No. 1 approved the construction of a High-Level Bridge, i.e., an approach road across the Mahan River on the Lanjit to Soubar Road, for which an amount of Rs. 732.53 lakhs has been sanctioned. The said bridge was proposed to be constructed bypassing Village Souhar, for which a No Objection Certificate (NOC) was granted by the villagers in the Gram Sabha meeting held on 28.11.2024.

4. Pursuant to the said approval, Respondent No. 2 issued Notice Inviting Tender (NIT) No. 177879 dated 08.12.2025, inviting tenders from eligible contractors for the construction of the High-Level Bridge, i.e., the approach road across the Mahan River on the Lanjit to Soubar Road. In response to the aforesaid NIT, Respondent No. 6, along with other eligible contractors, submitted its tender. After following due process, the tender of Respondent No. 6 was declared L-1 (lowest bidder), and accordingly, the contract was awarded in its favour. Vide order dated 29.12.2025, Respondent No. 1 directed Respondent No. 5 to complete the necessary formalities for execution of the High-Level Bridge in accordance with the prescribed norms and standards. Thereafter, an agreement was executed between Respondents No. 5 and 6, and a work order dated 13.01.2026 was issued in favour of Respondent No. 6 for completion of the construction work within a stipulated period of 14 months from the reckoned date. A copy of



the order dated 13.01.2026 has been annexed as **Annexure P-3**.

Despite completion of all necessary formalities, the construction of the High-Level Bridge, i.e., the approach road across the Mahan River on the Lanjit to Soubar Road, has not yet commenced.

5. It is submitted that, under the influence and pressure of certain local political leaders, the respondent authorities are attempting to change the approved site of construction and are deliberately not commencing construction at the originally sanctioned location. The complaints have been submitted against the proposed change of the construction site. Copies of the said complaints have been filed as as **Annexure P/4**.
6. The local and affected villagers, including members of the Pando Scheduled Tribe community, are protesting against the proposed change in the construction site. They have been staging a strike and continuing their protest for more than the last 20 days. However, till date, the respondent authorities have failed to consider the grievances and complaints of the villagers. The protest has also been widely reported in a local daily newspaper dated 31.01.2026.
7. It is further submitted that certain political leaders are intending to shift the construction of the High-Level Bridge towards the forest area with an ulterior motive to facilitate illegal activities, including smuggling of forest produce. If the High-Level Bridge is constructed at the originally proposed site, the villagers of Village



Souhar, Gram Panchayat Mayurdhakki, would gain improved connectivity and enhanced livelihood opportunities. However, the respondent authorities are attempting to alter the site of construction without justification. Hence, this petition.

8. The petitioner in person submits that the respondent authorities are seeking to change the duly approved site of construction of the High-Level Bridge, which action is arbitrary, unreasonable, and discriminatory, and therefore liable to be interfered with by this Hon'ble Court. The High-Level Bridge, i.e., the approach road across the Mahan River, was duly proposed and approved to be constructed on the Lanjit to Soubar Road, and the said decision was taken after due consideration and approval by the competent authorities. He further submits that the tender work was lawfully awarded in favour of Respondent No. 6, and a work order dated 13.01.2026 was issued in its favour. However, despite the issuance of the work order, the construction work has not commenced at the approved and sanctioned site. Notwithstanding the completion of all required formalities, the construction of the High-Level Bridge, i.e., the approach road across the Mahan River on the Lanjit to Soubar Road, has not yet been initiated by the concerned authorities.
9. He also submits that under the influence and pressure of certain local political persons, the respondent authorities are attempting to alter the approved place of construction and are deliberately



refraining from commencing the work at the sanctioned location.

Although complaints have been duly submitted objecting to the proposed change in the construction site, no action has been taken by the respondent authorities till date and the local and affected villagers, including members of the Pando Scheduled Tribe community, have been continuously protesting against the proposed change of the construction site and have been sitting on strike for more than 20 days. However, their grievances, concerns, and complaints have not been considered or redressed by the respondent authorities. He contended that certain political leaders intend to shift the construction of the High-Level Bridge towards the forest area for extraneous and ulterior motives. If the High-Level Bridge is constructed at the originally approved site, the villagers of Village Souhar, Gram Panchayat Mayurdhakki, would benefit from improved connectivity and enhanced livelihood opportunities. However, the respondent authorities are attempting to change the site of construction without any lawful or justifiable reason.

10. On the other hand, learned Advocate General appearing for the respondents/State opposes the submissions made by the petitioner in person and submits that the present petition is misconceived and liable to be dismissed. It is submitted that the tender process was conducted strictly in accordance with law, and after due procedure, Respondent No. 6 was declared L-1 and awarded the contract. A work order dated 13.01.2026 has already



been issued in favour of Respondent No. 6 and a formal agreement has been executed. Once the work order has been issued and contractual rights have crystallized, interference at this stage would adversely affect the execution of a public infrastructure project and prejudice the rights of the successful bidder. It is further submitted that decisions relating to the execution and implementation of such projects fall within the administrative and technical domain of the competent authorities and do not warrant interference in writ jurisdiction in the absence of established illegality or mala fides. Accordingly, the petition deserves to be dismissed.

11. Considering that Respondent No. 6 was declared L-1 and awarded the contract and a work order dated 13.01.2026 has already been issued in favour of Respondent No. 6 and a formal agreement has been executed, we do not find any good ground to entertain the present writ petition (PIL).
12. Accordingly, the writ petition (PIL) is liable to be and is hereby **dismissed**. Security deposit stands forfeited.

Sd/-

Sd/-

(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
Judge

(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice