

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3036 of 2025

=====

Sanjay Kumar S/o Ram Chandra Yadav, Resident of Rasalapur Ward No 11,
Post - Sonvarsha Raj, P.S. - Sonvarsha Raj, District.- Saharsa, Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Addl. Chief Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar.
2. Bihar State Educational Infrastructure Development Corporation Ltd. Bihar, Patna through its Managing Director.
3. The Chief Engineer, Bihar State Educational Infrastructure Development Corporation Ltd., Bihar, Patna.
4. The Superintendent Engineer, Bihar State Educational Infrastructure Development Corporation Ltd., Bihar, Patna.
5. The Executive Engineer, Bihar State Educational Infrastructure Development Corporation Ltd., Bihar, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sudhanshu Prakash, Advocate
For the Respondent Nos. 3,4,5 : Ms. Anukriti Jaipuriyar, Advocate
Mr. Rajanikant Kumar, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RANJAN KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH)

4 07-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. Following is the relief sought for in the present writ
application:-

“(i) Quashing the new Notice Inviting



Tender No. 05/2024-25 dated 21.08.2024 by the Respondent No. 2 by which the tender for the Construction of 82 Nos Additional Class Room in Saharsa District in total 12 Schools has been re-notified in an arbitrary and unreasonable manner without serving of notice cancelling the earlier Tender No. 56/2023-24 dated 09/01/2024 for which the petitioner was the lowest bidder in the financial bid.

(ii) A direction upon the respondents to grant work order to the petitioner in connection with Notice Inviting Tender No. 56/2023-24 dated 09/01/2024 with special reference to Serial No. 08 (Group no. ACR-1057) regarding:-

i. Construction of 82 Nos Additional Class Room in Saharsa District in total 12 Schools.

For which the tender process has been finalized and the financial bid has already been opened declaring the petitioner as the lowest bidder.”

3. Ms. Anukriti Jaipuriyar, learned counsel for the respondents submits that for the work in question, a work order has already been issued and pursuant thereto, an agreement has also been executed. It is further submitted that the work is already in progress.

4. Considering the aforesaid submission, this Court is of the view that the present writ application has become infructuous.

5. Accordingly, the present application stands



dismissed as having become infructuous.

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

(Sudhir Singh, J)

(Ranjan Kumar Jha, J)

Sachin/-

U			
---	--	--	--

