

Tripurari Prasad Singh Vs State Of Bihar

Court: Patna High Court

Date of Decision: March 17, 2023

Acts Referred: Constitution Of India, 1950 Article 14, 226

Hon'ble Judges: P. B. Bajanthri, J; Arun Kumar Jha, J

Bench: Division Bench

Advocate: Y.V. Giri, Manish Sahay, Anil Kumar Sinha, Radhika Raman, Ram Tujabh Singh, Santosh Chandra Bhaskar, Kumar Abhimanyu Pratap

Final Decision: Disposed Of

Judgement

1. Heard learned senior counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the respondents.

2. Initially, the present writ petition has been filed claiming the following reliefs :-

Ã¢â€(I) For after quashing of rescinding order of contract, issued vide Memo No. 41/Engg./2018/61/ Eng/ 2022 dated 28.01.2022 as well as

fresh NIT No. 15/ E-Tender/ BSTDC/ SBD/ 2021-22 dated 15.02.2022, as contained in Annexure P-4 & P-11, directing the concerned

respondent either allow the petitioner to complete the balance work in question within 2 (Two) months from the date of allow to do so Or

direct them to pay all contractual amount with relates to bill of work done including entire amount of security deposit and deducted amount

of Time Extension etc.

(II) For restraining the respondents for taking any coercive steps against the petitioner as well as creating third party right relates to fresh

tender during pendency of this writ application.

(III) For declaring that the actions of the respondents are arbitrariness, malafide, malicious, colourable exercise of power.

(IV) For further passing such an Order or Orders for which the petitioner is entitled under the law in the facts and circumstances of this

caseÃ¢â€.

3. Thereafter, the petitioner has filed an interlocutory application bearing I.A. No.1 of 2022 for amendment in the instant writ petition by adding

following relief in para 1 of the instant writ petition :

“ (V) For quashing of Notice for inviting very short Re-Tender No.16/E-Tender/BSTDC/ SBD of 2021-22 dated 25.02.2022 read with its

corrigendum issued vide letter no.212/Engg/2022 dated 07.03.2022 as contained in Annexure-P-13 series because without preparing final

bill in presence of the petitioner, the respondent Chief Engineer (i.e. Respondent No.5) has invited re-tender for “Remaining Work of

Development of Them Park at Bhitiharwa, West Champaran, under Gandhi Circuit”.

4. Again, the petitioner has filed an interlocutory application bearing I.A. No.2 of 2022 for amendment in the instant writ petition by adding following

relief in para 1 of the instant writ petition :

“ (VI) For quashing of Notice for inviting very short Re-Tender No.17/E-Tender/BSTDC/ SBD of 2021-22 dated 14.03.2022 as contained

in Annexure-P-14 because without preparing final bill in presence of the petitioner, the respondent Chief Engineer (i.e. Respondent No.5)

has invited re-tender for “Remaining Work of Development of Them Park at Bhitiharwa, West Champaran, under Gandhi Circuit for

estimated cost of Rs.710.54 lacs”.

5. Thereafter, the petitioner has filed an interlocutory application bearing I.A. No.3 of 2022 for impleading Mr. Saroj Narayan Prasad Singh, son of not

known, resident of Mohalla-Habibpura, Barara, P.O. +P.S.-Sohsarai, District-Nalanda as a party respondent no.9 in the instant writ petition on the

ground that during pendency of the instant writ petition, the respondent Corporation has created 3rd party interest in terms of liberty granted by this

Court vide order dated 11.05.2022. However, vide order dated 05.07.2022, the said interlocutory application has been dismissed as withdrawn as the

same has lost its significance.

6. Again, the petitioner has filed an interlocutory application bearing I.A. No.4 of 2022 for amendment in the instant writ petition by adding following

relief in para 1 of the instant writ petition :

“ (VII) For quashing of Memo No. 07/16/Engg./Ac/19/ 933/ Engg./2022 dated 27.09.2022 read with Memo No. 07/07/ Engg./Ac/18-19/

935 / Engg./ 2022 dated 28.09.2022, as contained in Annexure-P-19 series, issued under the signature of the Executive Engineer (i.e.

Respondent No.6) whereby and whereunder the said authority has passed the adjustment and payment order in terms of rescinding order

dated 28.01.2022 as contained in Annexure-P/4 at page-111 in most arbitrary manner and contrary to provision of agreement in

question”.

7. The short facts, according to the petitioner, are that pursuant to a Re-Tender Notice dated 10.07.2018 issued for construction and development of

theme park (with cafeteria and tourist amenities) at Bhitiharwa West Champaran under Gandhi Circuit for the year 2018-19 at an estimated cost of

Rs.1637.9 lacs, which has been corrected and sanctioned for Rs.11,99,02,000/- within 15 months from the date of work order, the petitioner

participated in the tender process and the said work was finally allotted in favour of the petitioner in accordance with law @ 5.40% below on

estimated costs. On 06.03.2019, a Letter of Acceptance was issued in favour of the petitioner. Thereafter, on 09.03.2019, Agreement No.

18/SBD/2018-19 was entered and executed among the parties for agreement value of Rs.11,43,27,292/-. A work order was also issued vide letter no.

241 dated 09.03.2019 for completing the said work within 15 months, i.e., on or before 08.06.2020 which was extended up-to 15.02.2022. The

petitioner had completed almost 50% of work as per agreement and only finishing work was left to be completed. Vide letter dated 28.01.2022,

agreement of the petitioner has been terminated alleging breach of contract and entire Performance and Additional Performance Security has been

forfeited besides that Risk and Cost upon the petitioner has also been imposed before the extended date of completion of work i.e. 15.02.2022. The

petitioner had submitted his 8th Running Account Bill amounting to Rs.5,29,82,114/- and it is not in dispute that till 7th R/A Bill, the petitioner has

received a payment of Rs.2,94,85,988/- and a sum of Rs.2,34,96,126/- is pending for making payment to the petitioner by the respondent Corporation

after checking and passing of the same. Thereafter, the petitioner has filed a representation on 31.01.2022 with a request to allow him to complete the

balance work till 31.03.2022 after recalling the rescinding order dated 28.01.2022. Lastly, the respondent Chief Engineer has issued very short Tender

No.15/E-Tender/BSTDC/ SBD/2021-22 for execution of balance work amounting to Rs.845.10 lacs. Subsequently, the balance work has been

assigned to a third party. Hence, the present Writ.

8. At the outset, the learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has submitted that though the dispute is arising out of the contractual

obligation and termination of contract by the respondents, concerning the issues involved, the writ petition is maintainable. The learned senior counsel

further submitted that the instant petition has been filed against the illegal act of the respondent no.3 as he rescinded the contract with the petitioner

vide order dated 28.01.2022, but the said order is itself illegal. The contract has been terminated by the respondent no.3 on directions of his higher

authorities and since the respondent no.3 has not applied his independent mind to the facts of the case, the order dated 28.01.2022 cannot be said to be

an order passed by the respondent no.3 on his own. Hence, the termination of the contract is wrong and incorrect and it is unlawful. So a legal issue is

involved in this case which can be agitated before the writ Court. In support of this contention, he has placed reliance on the following decisions :

- (i) 2023 SCC Online SC 116 (Gas Authority of India Ltd. Vs. Indian Petrochemicals Corporation Ltd. and Ors.)
- (ii) 2021 SCC Online SC 99 (Unitech Limited & Ors. Vs. Telangana State Industrial Infrastructure Corporation and Ors.)
- (iii) (2021) 6 SCC 15 (Uttar Pradesh Power Transmission Corporation Ltd. & Anr. Vs. CG Power & Industrial Solutions Ltd. & anr.)
- (iv) (2011) 5 SCC 697 (Union of India & Ors. Vs. The State of Bihar & Ors.)
- (v) (2022) 2 PLJR 161 (M/s Sanjeev Kumar Vs. The State of Bihar & Ors.)
- (vi) (1991) 1 PLJR 352 (FB) (M/s Pancham Singh Vs. The State of Bihar & Ors.)
- (vii) (2015) 13 SCC 592 (Ram Barai Singh & Company Vs. State of Bihar & Ors.)
- (viii) (2004) 3 SCC 553 (ABL International Ltd. & Anr. Vs. Export Credit Guarantee Corporation of India Ltd. & Ors.)
- (ix) (2010) 11 SCC 557 (Manohar Lal Vs. Ugrasen & Ors.)

9. The learned senior counsel for the petitioner further submitted that the petitioner had started execution of works at war footing but due to some

hindrance/obstruction which came during the execution period, he could not achieve the milestone for that the petitioner was not responsible. In spite

of that, the Executive Engineer has passed the order of termination/rescinding on 28.01.2022 without applying his independent mind. The learned

counsel further submitted that when the Executive Engineer himself admits in the rescinding order dated 28.01.2022 that time for completing the

remaining work was extended till 15.02.2022, but he has taken coercive action against the petitioner before such extended date of completion. The

learned senior counsel further submitted that from perusal of the rescinding order dated 28.01.2022 issued by the Executive Engineer, it is quite clear

that he himself admit that over the work site, there were several obstructions till September 2021 and it is also not in dispute that required designs for

the said project was provided to the petitioner on three earlier occasions by the consultant. So the petitioner was not in breach of contract and he is not

responsible for any kind of delay because situation was beyond his control. The learned senior counsel further submitted that the order terminating the

contract dated 28.01.2022 has been passed against the established canons of law. From paragraph 6 of the aforesaid order, it is clear that the

Executive Engineer has passed the order on the directions of the Minister, Tourism Department, Secretary, Tourism Department, Managing Director,

Bihar State Tourism Development Corporation Ltd., Patna and the concerned Chief Engineer as they directed him to rescind the contract of the

petitioner and put his name in the blacklist. Thus, the Executive Engineer has not applied his independent mind prior to rescinding the contract of the

petitioner.

Moreover, once the time for completion of remaining work was extended till 15.02.2022, the respondent no.6 could not have taken coercive action

against the petitioner before the end of the extended date and in this regard, the petitioner relied on the decision of the Patna High Court in the case of

Arjun Singh & Co. Vs. the Union of India & Ors., reported in PLJR 2008 (2) 485.

10. The learned senior counsel further submitted that the petitioner has submitted his 8th Running Account Bill amounting to Rs.5,29,82,114/- and it is

not in dispute that till 7th R/A Bill, the petitioner has received a payment of Rs.2,94,85,988/- and a sum of Rs.2,34,96,126/- is pending for making

payment to the petitioner by the respondent Corporation after checking and passing of the same. The learned senior counsel further submitted that on

earlier occasion, the respondent-Chief Engineer (respondent no.5) had invited tender for balance work vide NIT No.15/ E-Tender/ BSTDC/ SBD/

2021-22 dated 15.02.2022. Thereafter, all of a sudden, the respondents had issued fresh NIT No. 16/E-Tender/BSTDC/SBD of 2021-22 dated

25.02.2022 for the said remaining work, which was cancelled and another NIT No.17/E-Tender/BSTDC/SBD of 2021-22 dated 14.03.2022 has been

issued for remaining work.

11. The learned senior counsel further submitted that during the pendency of this writ application, the Executive Engineer passed payment and

adjustment orders dated 27.09.2022 and 28.09.2022 by which he has adjusted risk and cost amount of Rs.1,60,49,675.52/- from the payment of the

petitioner's liabilities. From perusal of the said payment order dated 27.09.2022, it appears that out of bill amount of Rs.5,29,82,114/-, the

respondents have admitted only Rs.4,42,95,726/- and balance claimed amount of Rs.86,86,388/- has been refused without assigning any reason and at

no point of time, they have given any opportunity to the petitioner to justify his bill/claimed amount. Hence, the petitioner would also be entitled for the

said balance amount of work done for the ends of justice. Besides that, the petitioner deserves refund of entire security deposit amounting to

Rs.52,13,659/- and deducted amount of Time Extension i.e. Rs.14,80,974/- and deposited amount of earnest money i.e. Rs. 22,90,000/- along

with interest @ 18% over entire payable amount from the date of said rescinding order and till the date of its realization. From perusal of adjustment

order dated 28.09.2022, it appears that the respondents have adjusted risk and cost amount of Rs.1,60,49,675.52/- from the payable amount of

Rs.1,67,65,256/- and rest payable amount i.e. Rs.7,15,580/- was kept pending till lapse of defect liability period, which was three years after the date

of completion.

12. The learned senior counsel further submitted that the contract of the petitioner could not be terminated and forfeiture of security deposit and

imposition of cost could take place under Clause 3 (7) (a & b) of the contract only for breach of contract admitted by the petitioner and otherwise not.

In the instant case, the petitioner has not admitted breach of contract. So, the rescinding order dated 28.01.2022 is illegal and against the specific terms

of the contract and, therefore, his entire security deposit/Additional Performance Security/ Performance Security deposit/deducted amount of Time

Extension and other lawful amount including work done amount relating to the said agreement be paid to the petitioner without any further delay.

13. On the other hand, the learned counsel for the respondents has submitted that the instant writ petition filed by the petitioner suffers from vice of

multiple reliefs in one case, so it is not maintainable on the factual aspects of the matter and on the point of law. Hence, it may be dismissed on this

count itself. He has further submitted that the petitioner has approached this Court by ignoring and neglecting the provisions of alternative remedy

given under clause 25 of the contract which provides for arbitration in case of dispute. Both the parties of the contract are bound by its provisions and

mandate of the contract at first place and must not be allowed to jump over the provisions of the contract. Therefore, this writ petition which has been

filed without exhausting alternative remedy provided under the contract is fit to be dismissed on this point of law alone. The learned counsel further

submitted that tender has been awarded to one Saroj Narayan Prasad Singh being successful bidder and letter of acceptance dated 22.04.2022 has

been issued to him and approx 25% of work has been completed by the said contractor. The learned counsel further submitted that the Tourism

Ministry, Govt. of India vide letter dated 07.01.2022 had clearly directed that if the whole project including all components was not finished up to

31.03.2022 then rest amount would not be granted by the Government of India, rather the same would have to be borne by the State Government of

Bihar which would have badly affected the image of Bihar Government besides creating unnecessary financial liabilities on public money of the State

of Bihar. The learned counsel further submitted that the petitioner has been given twenty months extra time to complete the work, but he has never

taken interest to abide the conditions incorporated in the agreement and extended time to complete the work within time limit stipulated. Though there

was some practical and technical problems at initial stage, but the same were resolved by the respondents authorities at the earliest. The petitioner has

been warned several times earlier for slow pace of work, but he kept making false promise to the respondents. The petitioner had given an affidavit

and a letter, both dated 04.08.2021 to the effect that he would complete the work by December, 2021, still he failed to keep up his promise given on

affidavit. The other contractors, who were facing the same conditions and working in the same campus, had executed and completed their work

within the stipulated time limit. The project was delayed and remained incomplete due to lackadaisical approach of the petitioner only, which compelled

the respondents to take strong action against the petitioner and, as such, the respondent no.6 vide letter dated 11.12.2021 issued show cause to the

petitioner as to why the contract be not rescinded and why not he be blacklisted for failure to complete the work. The learned counsel further

submitted that a supervision meeting was conducted by the Principal Secretary, Tourism Department on 16.12.2021 in which the petitioner was also

present. The authorities expressed their displeasure in strong terms and sought explanation from the petitioner whereupon the petitioner asked for

some extra time up to 15.02.2022 to complete the work. The Principal Secretary directed the respondent no.2 BSTDC to supervise the work being

done by the contractor on regular basis and if satisfactory progress was not found, then to take steps to blacklist the petitioner-contractor by publishing

short tender notice. In terms of the aforesaid direction of the Principal Secretary, the technical team visited the site on 27.12.2021 and 16.01.2022

wherein no satisfactory progress was found to draw inference that project would be completed within third extra time given to the petitioner. In the

supervision meeting of the Principal Secretary dated 20.01.2022, it was found that progress of work was not satisfactory enough to suggest the

completion of work within extra time of 15.02.2022 and, accordingly, the Executive Engineer passed a detailed order dated 28.01.2022 after

considering all aspects of the case and thereby rescinded the contract and forfeited the entire performance and additional performance security as per

provisions of contract. Furthermore, the petitioner had hardly less than three weeks to complete the work from the date of impugned action, i.e., up to

15.02.2022 and it was highly impracticable for him to complete the remaining work.

14. The learned counsel for the respondents further submitted that Clauses 3 (i) to (vii) of the contract are quite explicit and the said clause provides

for recession/termination of the contract in case the petitioner is found to be lagging or negligent in carrying out his obligation and does not complete

the work within the specified period in the notice given in writing. The respondents have rescinded the contract in terms of express provision of the

contract and extended time and there is no illegality in it.

15. The learned counsel for the respondents further submitted that the order dated 28.01.2022 is a speaking order and it mentions in detail the events

taking place in the matter towards execution of the contract by the petitioner and default made by him despite constant reminders. The petitioner even

attended the meetings. The learned counsel stressed the schedule dates to buttress his submission that the petitioner was granted a number of

opportunities to complete the work and despite so much indulgences being shown, the petitioner failed to complete the project. The learned counsel

further submitted that the petitioner even attended the meetings called by the respondents in which he was impressed upon to complete the work and

every possible help was extended to him and when it was found that the petitioner was not interested in completing the work assigned to him, despite

extension of time period of completion of work till 15.02.2022, the contract was terminated vide order dated 28.01.2022 since it was found that it was

impracticable for the petitioner to complete the work within the extended period and since the project has already overshot the time period and there

was every possibility of Central Government not providing funding for the project if it was not completed by 31.03.2022, the entire financial burden

would have shifted to the State Government resulting in loss of face for the State Government. Cumulatively taking all these points into consideration,

the respondent no.3 was left with no option but to terminate the contract.

16. The learned counsel for the respondents vehemently denied that the contract was rescinded at the instance of higher authorities of respondent

no.3. The learned counsel further submitted that from bare perusal of the order dated 28.01.2022 shows only a supervisory meeting was conducted to

take stock of the situation by the higher authorities of the respondent no.2 and finding the tardy progress of the work and considering the

unsatisfactory work of the petitioner and also taking into account the previous conduct of the petitioner as enumerated in paragraphs 2 to 5 of the

order dated 28.01.2022, the decision was taken to rescind the contract of the petitioner and also for blacklisting him. It cannot be said that the

respondent no.3 took the decision only on the basis of the decision arrived at in the meeting of the higher authorities of respondent no.3 because the

contents of the order dated 28.01.2022 clearly show that the respondent no.3 arrived at an independent conclusion based on the material facts which

have been mentioned from paragraph 2 to 5 (supra) and paragraph 6 of the aforesaid order is only the logical culmination of the events in hand.

17. The learned counsel for the respondents further submitted that the alternative prayer of the petitioner is with regard to disputed questions of facts

about his claims regarding the payment of contractual amount and forfeiture of earnest money and other financial issues regarding payments made

and claim of balance amount. There are other issues with regard to payment of interest and adjustment of risk and cost amount. These issues cannot

be agitated before a writ Court and the petitioner has a remedy under clause 25 of the Contract which provides for settlement of dispute by

arbitration.

18. The learned counsel for the respondents again reiterated that the petitioner has got alternative efficacious remedy by either resorting to the

provisions of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 or taking recourse to the provisions of the Bihar Public Works Contracts Disputes Arbitration

Tribunal Act, 2008. Hence, no interference is required by this Court in this matter.

19. Having considered the material available on record and further considering the rival submission, in the present case, this Court is required to

examine first the maintainability of the writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

20. It is well settled principle of law that while entertaining an objection as to the maintainability of a writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution

of India, the Court should bear in mind the fact that the power to issue prerogative writs under Article 226 of the Constitution is plenary in nature and

is not limited by any other provisions of the Constitution. The High Court having regard to the facts of the case, has a discretion to entertain or not to

entertain a writ petition. The Court has imposed upon itself certain restrictions in the exercise of this power. And this plenary right of the High Court

to issue a prerogative writ will not normally be exercised by the Court to the exclusion of other available remedies unless such action of the State or its

instrumentality is so arbitrary and unreasonable so as to violate the constitutional mandate or Article 14 or for other valid and legitimate reasons, for

which the Court thinks it necessary to exercise the said jurisdiction.

21. Therefore, while exercising its jurisdiction under Article 226, the Court is entitled to enquire into whether the action of the State or its

instrumentalities is arbitrary or unfair and in consequence, in violation of Article 14. The jurisdiction under Article 226 is a valuable constitutional

safeguard against an arbitrary exercise of State power or a misuse of authority. In determining as to whether the jurisdiction should be exercised in a

contractual dispute, the Court must, undoubtedly eschew, disputed questions of fact which would depend upon an evidentiary determination requiring a

trial. But equally, it is well settled that the jurisdiction under Article 226 cannot be ousted only on the basis that the dispute pertains to the contractual

arena. This is for the simple reason that the State and its instrumentalities are not exempt from the duty to act fairly merely because in their business

dealings they have entered into the realm of contract. Similarly, the presence of an arbitration clause does oust the jurisdiction under Article 226 in all

cases though, it still needs to be decided from case to case as to whether recourse to a public law remedy can justifiably be invoked.

22. Giving our thoughtful consideration on the aspect of the maintainability, the Apex Court in ABL International Ltd. (supra) in paragraph 27 has held

as under :

“27. From the above discussion of ours, the following legal principles emerge as to the maintainability of a writ petition:

(a) In an appropriate case, a writ petition as against a State or an instrumentality of a State arising out of a contractual obligation is

maintainable.

(b) Merely because some disputed questions of fact arise for consideration, same cannot be a ground to refuse to entertain a writ petition in

all cases as a matter of rule.

(c) A writ petition involving a consequential relief of monetary claim is also maintainable.”

23. On the other hand, in the case of Union of India and Ors. Vs. Puna Hinda, reported in (2021) 10 SCC 690, the Apex Court has held that in the

contractual matters in the field of private law are better adjudicated upon by the forum agreed to by the parties. For example, the dispute as to

whether any amount is payable or not and/or how much amount is payable are disputed questions of facts and cannot be adjudicated by the

writ court.

24. From the aforesaid discussions, it seems reasonable to conclude that wherever mixed questions of law and facts are involved, the writ Court has

jurisdiction to look into the matter under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. The present case being one such instance, we hold that this Court has

got jurisdiction to entertain the writ petition.

25. The contention of the petitioner is confined basically against rescinding of his contract and the petitioner has assailed the order of rescinding of the

contract mainly on two grounds; firstly that despite extension granted till 15.12.2021, his contract was terminated on 28.01.2022. Secondly, the order

has been assailed on the ground that the respondent no.3 passed the rescinding order on the directions of his higher authorities. But we are afraid that

both the contentions are not sustainable in the light of facts and circumstances and under the contractual obligation of the parties. The record shows

the petitioner was the successful bidder for construction and development of theme park at Bhitiharwa, West Champaran and he was issued a work

order to proceed with the work vide order dated 09.03.2019. In terms of the contract, the petitioner was supposed to complete the work till

08.06.2020. The petitioner gave his letter of acceptance on 06.03.2019 and vide further letter dated 12.04.2019, the petitioner submitted a work

programme time line with an undertaking to complete the work by June, 2020. Thereafter, due to non-completion of work by the petitioner till

08.06.2020, which was the scheduled date for completion of the work, the petitioner was issued a reminder on 08.12.2020 with a warning that he

would be debarred from further participating in any bid. Further letters of warning were issued to the petitioner on 09.02.2021 and 04.06.2021 by the

respondents. When the work was not completed even three months after 30.05.2021, the date which was fixed for completion of the work, the

petitioner was finally directed to complete the work by December, 2021 and to furnish an affidavit in this regard. Meanwhile, when it was found that

the petitioner has been grossly negligent, a letter dated 16.08.2021 was issued further extending warning to the petitioner. Though the petitioner

submitted an undertaking to complete the work by 31.12.2021. Seeing the indifferent attitude of the petitioner, he was debarred to participate in any

future tender vide order dated 19.11.2021 by the respondent no.3. In a meeting dated 15.12.2021 which was also attended by the petitioner, the

petitioner was directed to complete the work on or before 15.02.2022 with the rider that periodic supervision of the progress in the work would be

made. It further appears from the record that when the progress was found to be tardy and there was no likelihood of completion of the work till

15.12.2022, the respondent no.3 moved to rescind the contract vide order dated 28.01.2022. So, the claim of the petitioner that his contract could not

have been terminated before the expiry of the extended time could not be sustained in view of the aforesaid discussions, dates and events which show

the petitioner has been given ample opportunity to complete the work but he failed to honour his commitment.

26. On the second aspect of the contention of the petitioner that the respondent no.3 passed the order on the directions of his higher authorities, the

said contention is also not sustainable. The order dated 28.01.2022 is reproduced below for ready reference :

27. A bare perusal of the order dated 28.01.2022 shows the respondent no.3 has elaborately discussed various stages starting from notice inviting

tender till passing of the order dated 28.01.2022 and the same shows the respondent no.3 has taken the decision in the totality of the facts and

circumstances of the case and not on the basis of the directions of his higher authorities. Paragraphs 2 to 5 of the order dated 28.01.2022 clearly bring

out the fact on fore that the conduct of the petitioner was considered at length in the said order. Paragraph 6 of the said order is only consequential to

the other developments in the matter and only stamps the inevitable, it is one of the incidental facts which was also considered by the respondent no.3

as it appears from the concluding paragraph of the order. The contention of the petitioner regarding the order dated 28.01.2022 is thus without any

merit and hence is brushed aside.

28. In view of the discussions made regarding the contention of the petitioner, we find and hold that the petitioner has failed to make out any case in

his support and the order dated 28.01.2022 is without any blemish and hence, the same is sustainable.

29. So far as the claim of the petitioner to allow him to complete the balance work in question is concerned, in the light of the aforesaid discussions,

the same could not be allowed. Moreover, it is clear from the pleadings that the respondents floated a fresh tender and awarded the work to third

party and it has been submitted at the bar that the remaining work has been completed by the third party.

30. Further, the claim of the petitioner to pay all contractual amount with relates to bill of work done including entire amount of security deposit and

deducted amount of time extension etc. against the respondents is concerned, the same being a disputed questions of fact and cannot be adjudicated

by this Court and in this regard, we place our reliance on the decision rendered in Union of India and Ors. (supra). Furthermore, clause 25 of the

conditions of contract provides for settlement of disputes by arbitration and the petitioner is at liberty to take recourse of the said clause of the contract

in case of his grievance.

31. With the aforesaid observations and directions, this writ petition stands disposed of.