

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P.(C) No. 1319 of 2015

M/s Ganesh Ram Dokania

..... **Petitioner**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand & Ors.

..... **Respondents**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Appellants :Mr. Sachin Kumar, Advocate

For the Respondents :Mr. J.F. Toppo, Advocate

10/Dated:13.01.2020

I.A. No. 2413 of 2015

1. This interlocutory application has been filed for amendment in the prayer portion of the writ petition.

2. Mr. Sachin Kumar, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that during pendency of this writ petition the bank guarantee submitted by the petitioner has been invoked by the respondent-State and that is why it was necessitated to file this interlocutory application. Mr. Kumar further submits that a letter dated 09.04.2015 has been brought on record by way of filing I.A as Annexrure-1 by which the bank guarantee of the petitioner has been invoked during pendency of this writ petition.

3. Mr. J.F. Toppo, learned counsel appearing for the respondent-State submits that the bank guarantee has already been invoked.

4. Considering the fact that this writ petition has been filed for challenging the termination of the agreement with regard to work allotted to the petitioner and if the prayer made for amendment of this writ petition is allowed then nature of the the writ petition will not changed. Accordingly, the prayer made in the interlocutory application is allowed.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner is directed to make out necessary correction in the prayer portion of the writ petition with red ink in course of the day. He is further directed to bring on record the letter dated 09.04.2015 and 26.03.2015 by way of filing supplementary affidavit.

6. Mr. Toppo at this stage shall take instruction with regard to amended prayer of the writ petition within three weeks.

7. I.A. stands allowed and disposed of.

I.A. No. 3970 of 2015

1. I.A. No. 3970 of 2015 has been filed for seeking amendment with regard to fresh tender.
2. Mr. Toppo, learned counsel for the respondent State submits that tender has already been effected.
3. In that view of the matter this interlocutory application stands dismissed as being infructuous.

W.P.(C) No. 1319 of 2015

1. List this case after three weeks.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi J.)

Tarun /-Rohit