

CF
100/- (3)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR

Writ Petition No: 1013 of 2002

PETITIONER

: M/s R K Steel Fabricators,
Through its proprietor,
Rajesh Kumar Singh,
S/o Narayan Prasad Singh,
Aged about 29 years,
Resident of Chitra Electronics
10, Pushpanjali Complex near
Niharika talkies, Korba
Dist. Korba, Chhattisgarh.

P. R. No. 1059/02
Presented by Shri. Rajesh Kumar Singh
dated 17.5.02

RESPONDENTS :

1. Chhattisgarh State
Electricity Board, through
Its Secretary,
Chhattisgarh Electricity
Board, Dangia, Raipur.
Chhattisgarh
2. The Supdt. Engineer (P&W),
CSEB, Korba (E)
3. M/s Arun Constructions
Through its Proprietor,
Rajendra Tiwari, MIG-3
1/35 Maharana Pratap
Nagar, Dist. Korba
Chhattisgarh.



Writ petition under article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for
issuance of appropriate writ, writs, order direction etc.

(167)

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P. No. 1013 / सन् 2002

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	<p>29-01-2003</p> <p>Shri Sanjay K Agarwal, counsel for the petitioner.</p> <p>Shri Manindra Shrivastava, counsel for the respondents No.1 & 2.</p> <p>Shri Awadh Tripathi, counsel for the respondent No.3.</p> <p>Admittedly, there was some objection regarding award of contract. After notice, the matter had come up on 12-8-2002, on which date the Court had directed that if so advised, the authority may take steps to negotiate for a fresh offer. Thereafter, the matter had come up on 13-01-2003 wherein the following order was passed (relevant portion is reproduced here):</p> <p>“..... When the matter came up on 12-8-2002 considering the dispute, the Court had observed that the Authorities may, if so advised, take steps to negotiate for fresh offers or invite fresh offers. It is stated by the learned counsel that in terms of the direction they had asked for fresh offers which have been received and looking to the objection that was raised by the petitioner, the Court feels that there should not be any impediment in taking a decision on the basis of the fresh offers. Shri Awadh Tripathi, learned counsel for the respondent No.3 also states that respondent No.3 will not be aggrieved if a decision is taken on the basis of fresh offers. However, Shri Agarwal, learned counsel for the petitioner wants some time to obtain instructions.”</p>	

[पीठ संख्या]

-2-

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक

COP No. 1013 / 02

सन् 200

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित -2-	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	<p>Today when the matter has come up for hearing, learned counsel for the petitioner stated that an additional return has already been filed to the effect that fresh bids have been received, copy whereof is Annexure R-4. In this view of the matter, it is fairly stated by learned counsel on behalf of the petitioner as also respondent No.3 that further action may be taken on the basis of fresh offers received as reflected in Annexure R-4 to the additional return. Ordered accordingly.</p> <p>The writ petition stands disposed of. Consequently M.W.P. No.4751/02 & 429/2002 for vacating stay and I.A. Nos.4192/2002 & 4901/2002 are stand disposed of.</p>	<div data-bbox="1133 1354 1455 1553" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; text-align: center;"> Sd/- P.C. Naik Judge </div>

Roshan /-

[पीठ देखें]

27/11/12