

**HIGH COURT OF TRIPURA
AGARTALA
WP(C)No.130 of 2023**

Smt. Champa Nag(Banik)

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Tripura and Others

.....Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. P. Roy Barman, Sr. Adv. Ms. A. Debbarma, Adv.
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. B.N. Majumder, Sr. Adv. Mr. R. Saha, Adv.

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE (ACTING)

Order

13.03.2023

Heard Mr. P. Roy Barman, learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner as well as Mr. B.N. Majumder, learned senior counsel appearing for the respondents.

2. The petitioner is appointed as LPG Distributor of India Oil Corporation Limited, in short IOCL at Fatikroy, Unokoti District. Being so appointed, the petitioner is required to construct one LPG Showroom and one LPG Godown within six months. The petitioner has already constructed the LPG showroom. But the construction of LPG Godown cannot be completed till date as group of miscreants has been forcefully stopping the construction work. For that, the petitioner has filed Civil Misc(Inj)22 of 2022 and T.S. 39 of 2022 before the Civil Judge, Junior Division, Kailashahar, Unokoti District. But all on a sudden by a letter dated 30.08.2022, the Divisional LPG Sales

Head Indane DO, Silchar cancelled the appointment of the petitioner for LPG Distributorship at Fatikroy, Unokoti, Tripura against which the petitioner approached the Hon'ble High Court by filing a writ petition being WP(C)No.794 of 2022. The Hon'ble High Court vide order dated 14.11.2022 directed the respondents to give the petitioner an opportunity to pass a reasoned order in accordance with law within a period of two months. Thereafter, vide order dated 12.01.2023 issued by the Divisional LPG Head, Silchar, IDO, Indane Divisional Office, the LOI issued in favour of the petitioner on 31.03.2021 remained cancelled. Hence, by filing this writ petition, the petitioner has challenged the order dated 12.01.2023 issued by the Divisional LPG Head, Silchar, IDO, Indane Divisional Office.

Heard both sides.

3. It is seen from the impugned order that the Construction as required by the India Oil Corporation Limited has not been completed and according to the reasoning, the petitioner has completed only 10% which is true and the claim made by the petitioner that he has completed 50% works is incorrect.

4. However, without going into the disputed question of facts and as prayed by Mr. Roy Barman, learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner that the petitioner would complete the construction as per the required norms, some reasonable time is granted, this court feels that the request made is reasonable and further in the interest of the consumers for providing gas supply, some more time is granted to the petitioner.

5. Accordingly, this court grants the petitioner to complete the works as per the norms on or before 30th of May, 2023. However, it is made clear that no further extension of time would be granted. For any other reliefs, the petitioner is at liberty to pursue the matter to the respondents.

In terms of the above, the present petition is disposed of.

CHIEF JUSTICE (ACTING)

