

GAHC010064752020



**THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT**  
**(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)**

**Case No. : WRIT PETITION (C) No. 7907/2018**

Bhumidhar Baruah, S/o - Lt Rabiram Barua, Village –  
Dhupabar, P.O. – Malibazar, P.S. – Gohpur, District –  
Biswanath, Assam.

.....Petitioner

-Versus-

1. The Union of India, Represented by the Secretary to the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi- 110001.
2. The Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Ltd., Representaed by its Managing Director, Petroleum House, Mumbai- 400020.
3. The Chief General Manager, LPG Region, Kolkata Regional Office, HPCL (EZ), West Bengal, Kolkata - 7000107.
4. The Senior General Manager, LPG Region, HPCL Ghy, IRD Betkuchi, Near Balaji Mandir Nh- 37, Guwahati-40.

.....Respondents

**With**

**I.A.[CIVIL] No. 965/2020**

Bhumidhar Baruah, S/o - Lt Rabiram Barua, Village –

Dhupabar, P.O. – Malibazar, P.S. – Gohpur, District –  
Biswanath, Assam.

.....***Applicant***

**-Versus-**

1. The Union of India, Represented by the Secretary to the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi- 110001.
2. The Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Ltd., Represented by its Managing Director, Petroleum House, Mumbai- 400020.
3. The Chief General Manager, LPG Region, Kolkata Regional Office, HPCL (EZ), West Bengal, Kolkata - 7000107.
4. The Senior General Manager, LPG Region, HPCL Ghy, IRD Betkuchi, Near Balaji Mandir Nh- 37, Guwahati-40.

.....***Opposite parties***

**Advocates :**

|                          |                                                               |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| Petitioner               | : Mr. R.P. Sarmah, Senior Counsel,<br>Mr. D. Doley, Advocate. |
| Respondent no. 1         | : Mr. K. Gogoi, Central Government Counsel                    |
| Respondent nos. 2, 3 & 4 | : Mr. S. Borthakur, Advocate                                  |
| Date of Judgment & Order | : 16.05.2023                                                  |

**BEFORE**  
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANISH CHOUDHURY**  
**JUDGMENT & ORDER [ORAL]**

This writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is preferred

by the writ petitioner seeking *inter alia* a direction in the nature of Mandamus to the respondent authorities of the Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited [HPCL] to appoint the petitioner as a Liquefied Petroleum Gas [LPG] Distributor at a location, Dipara Pukhuri by suspending a Re-Draw Notice uploaded by the respondent authorities on 03.11.2018.

2. The genesis behind the writ petition is an Advertisement published jointly by three Public Sector Oil Marketing Companies [OMCs] viz. [i] Indian Oil Corporation Limited [IOCL]; [ii] Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited [BPCL] and [iii] Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited [HPCL]; for selection and appointment of distributors of LPG at 93 locations in different districts all over the State of Assam. By the said Advertisement published in the Assamese daily newspaper, 'Asomiya Pratidin' in its issue dated 25.05.2018, the Public Sector OMCs invited applications on-line from interested candidates with 25.06.2018 as the last date of submission of such applications on-line.

3. The Advertisement *inter alia* laid down the eligibility criteria for distributorship of LPG. The applicants were requested to go through the related Brochure i.e. 'the Brochure on Unified Guidelines for Selection of LPG Distributors' carefully before filling up the details in the applications and it was informed that the same was available in the website : [www.lpgvitarakchayan.in](http://www.lpgvitarakchayan.in). The eligibility criteria were mentioned in detail in 'the Brochure on Unified Guidelines for Selection of LPG Distributors' [hereinafter referred to as 'the Unified Selection Guidelines', for short] for Sheheri Vitrak, Rurban Vitrak, Gramin Vitrak and Durgam Kshetriya Vitrak.

3.1. Clause 1 of the Brochure on Unified Selection Guidelines has provided the definitions of different terms. For the purpose of the present writ petition, Clause 1[w] is of relevance, which reads as follows :-

1[w] 'Ownership' or 'own' for godown / showroom for Shehri Vitrak, Rurban Vitrak, Gramin Vitrak and Durgam Kshetriya Vitrak Type of Distributorship means having :

- a. Ownership title of the property;

Or

- b. Registered lease deed having minimum 15 years of valid lease period commencing on any day from the date of advertisement up to the last date of submission of application as specified either in the advertisement or corrigendum [if any].

Additionally, applicants having registered lease deed commencing on any date prior to the date of advertisement will also be considered provided the lease is valid for a minimum period of 15 years from the date of advertisement. The applicant should have ownership as defined under the term 'own' above in the name of the applicant / member of 'Family Unit' [as defined in multiple dealership / distributorship norm of eligibility criteria] / parents [includes Step Father / Step Mother], grandparents [both maternal and paternal], Brother / Sister [including Step Brother & Step Sister], Son / Daughter [includes Step Son / Step daughter], Son-in-law / Daughter-in-law; of the applicant or the spouse [in case of married daughter] as on the last date for submission of application as specified in the advertisement or corrigendum [if any]. In case of ownership / co-ownership by family member[s] as given above, consent in the form of a declaration from the family member[s] will be required.

In case the share of land in the jointly owned property by the applicant / member of 'Family Unit' [as defined in multiple dealership / distributorship norm] / parents & grandparents [both maternal and paternal] of the applicant or the spouse with any other person[s] meets the requirement of land including the dimensions required, then that land for godown / showroom should qualify for eligibility as 'own' land subject to submission of 'No Objection Certificate; in the form of declaration from other owner[s].

3.2. Clause 8 has provided for the eligibility criteria for the applicants. As per sub-clause [m] of Clause 8.A : Common Eligibility Criteria, an applicant should 'Own' a plot of land of capacity, minimum dimensions and in location as

specified therein for construction of LPG Godown or 'Own' a ready LPG cylinder storage godown as on the last date of submission of application as specified either in the Advertisement or Corrigendum [if any]. Further, for Showroom, applicable only for Sheheri Vitrak, Rurban Vitrak and Gramin Vitrak, an applicant should 'Own' a suitable shop for Showroom of size specified therein or a plot of land for construction of Showroom of specified dimensions as on the last of submission of application as specified either in the Advertisement or Corrigendum [if any].

3.3. All the applicants for the locations were required to submit their applications by registering on the web-based portal : [www.lpgvitarakchayan.in](http://www.lpgvitarakchayan.in) on-line along with the requisite application fee. The Brochure on Unified Selection Guidelines had prescribed a non-refundable application fee of Rs. 10,000/- for Open category, Rs. 5,000/- for Other Backward Classes [OBC] category, and Rs. 2,500/- for Scheduled Caste [SC] / Scheduled Tribe [ST] category, through on-line payment. It was mentioned that the list of eligible applicants for Draw of Lots would be made available on the notice board of the concerned office of the Public Sector OMC as well as in the website of the concerned Public Sector OMC. The eligible candidates were to be informed through e-mail/sms to report at specified venue, date and time for the Draw of Lots for selection of LPG distributors.

3.4. The successful candidates would be selected from amongst the eligible candidates for LPG distributorship for the concerned location. After the Draw of Lots, the selected candidate would be required to submit an amount equivalent to 10% of the security deposit along with the relevant documents, listed in

Clause 8 of the Brochure on Unified Selection Guidelines, to the concerned office the Public Sector OMC within 7 [seven] days from the date of intimation.

3.5. After deposit of the afore-mentioned amount i.e. 10% of the security deposit and the required documents, Field Verification of Credentials [FVC] of the successful candidates would be carried out including verification of the plot of land offered for Godown and/or Showroom. If during the FVC process the land mentioned by the applicant for godown / showroom in his application was found not meeting the eligibility conditions / requirements as stipulated in the Advertisement / Unified Selection Guidelines / application form and if the applicant was having any alternate land in his name/members of the 'Family Unit' / lease on or before the last date for submission of application as specified either in the Advertisement or Corrigendum [if any] the same could be considered at the time of FVC.

4. One of the 93 different locations in the State of Assam for which the applications were invited for selection of LPG distributors by the Advertisemetn dated 25.05.2018, the location at Serial no. 26, Dipara Pukhuri under Kalyanpur Gaon Panchayat, Chaiduar Block, District - Sonitpur, Assam [hereinafter referred to as 'the subject-location', for short] under the respondent Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited [HPCL] is the subject-matter of the present lis. The subject-location falls amongst rural locations and the LPG distributorship is reserved for candidates belonging to OBC category. The type of distributorship area is mentioned as Gramin Vitrak area. As per the Unified Selection Guidelines, LPG distributorship located in 'Rural Area' is called as Gramin Vitrak and it caters services to the LPG customers of a specified rural area. It covers all villages

falling within 15 Kms from the boundary limits of the LPG distributorship and/or the area specified by the concerned OMC.

5. Considering himself to be qualified, the petitioner in response to the said Advertisement dated 25.05.2018, submitted his application on-line before the last date of submission i.e. on 24.06.2018 and his application was registered vide Reference no. HPC 12602094224062018. After the applications which were received for the subject-location, were processed, the petitioner was notified by a letter dated 21.07.2018 by the Kolkata Regional Office, HPCL that the petitioner was found qualified for on-line computerized Draw of Lots for selection of LPG Distributorship for the subject-location. The petitioner was requested to be present in person along with his photo identity for the on-line computerized Draw of Lots to be held at 10-00 a.m. on 02.08.2018 at the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Hojai. Accordingly, the petitioner attended the on-line computerized Draw of Lots at the time, place and venue as intimated by the letter dated 21.07.2018.

6. In the Draw of Lots conducted on 02.08.2018 for selection of LPG distributorship for the subject-location, the petitioner was declared as the successful candidate and the said fact was intimated to the petitioner by a letter dated 03.08.2018 by the Kolkata Regional Office, HPCL. By the letter dated 03.08.2018, the petitioner was requested to deposit an amount of Rs. 30,000/-, as applicable to the subject-location in line with the provisions of the Unified Selection Guidelines within 7 [seven] working days from 03.08.2018. The petitioner was also requested to submit a set of documents specified therein within 7 [seven] working days at the specified office of the respondent HPCL. It

was further informed that verification of all self-attested photocopies shall be verified with the original documents during the Field Verification of Credentials [FVC]. Amongst the documents required to be submitted by the petitioner was documents pertaining to land/godown/showroom in the name of the petitioner or a member of family unit in the form of a Registered Sale Deed/Gift Deed/Lease Deed of minimum 15 years mutation and Government records, fulfilling the criteria specified by the 'Ownership' or 'Own' clause. It was mentioned that the 'Ownership' of the land offered for godown / showroom as defined in the Unified Selection Guidelines should be valid as per the dates specified therein.

7. In response to the letter dated 03.08.2018, the petitioner stated to have submitted his documents including a self-attested photocopies of the original registered Lease Deed and the notarized Lease Agreement dated 19.06.2018 pertaining to a plot of land measuring 1 Bigha & 3 Kathas, covered by Dag no. 59 of Kheraj Miadi Pattta no. 54, located at Revenue Village – Dipara Pukhuri within Mouza - Kalongpur, District – Biswanath, as asked for by the letter dated 03.08.2018, on 09.08.2018. The petitioner had also deposited an amount of Rs. 30,000/- in favour of the respondent HPCL through a demand draft on 08.08.2018.

8. It is the case of the petitioner that after Field Verification of Credentials [FVC] was carried out, the respondent HPCL authorities without any further intimation to the petitioner, had uploaded a Re-Draw Notice on 03.11.2018 whereby the respondent HPCL authorities had again published a list of

applicants, found eligible for Re-Draw of Lots for selection on LPG distributor for the same subject-location. Dipara Pukhuri. Being aggrieved by the publication of the Re-Draw Notice, the petitioner has preferred the instant writ petition originally with the prayer for suspension of the Re-Draw Notice dated 03.08.2018 and for a direction to the respondent authorities in the HPCL to appoint the petitioner as the LPG distributor at the subject-location.

9. I have heard Mr. R.P. Sarmah, learned Senior Counsel assisted by Mr. D. Doley, learned counsel for the petitioner; Mr. K. Gogoi, learned Central Government Counsel for the respondent no. 1; and Mr. S. Borthakur, learned counsel for the respondent nos. 2, 3 & 4. As agreed to by the learned counsel for the parties, the writ petition is taken up for final adjudication at the admission stage itself, along with the connected interlocutory application, I.A. [Civil] no. 965/2020.

10. Mr. Sarmah, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner in support of his claim of ownership of the plot of land offered for setting up the LPG distributorship at the subject-location, had submitted an Agreement of Lease executed, on 19.06.2018, between one Kamal Newar and the petitioner. As per the Agreement of Lease, the petitioner took a plot of land measuring 1 Bigha & 3 Kathas, out of a plot of land totaling 5 Bighas & 3 Kathas, belonging to the lessor on lease and the said plot of land was covered by Dag no. 59 & Kheraj Myadi Pattta no. 54 at Revenue Village – Dipara Pukhuri near PWD Road, Mouza - Kalongpur, District – Biswanath. He has referred to the said Agreement of Lease dated 19.06.2018, annexed as Annexure E-5 to the

writ petition, to submit that at a later point of time, the petitioner submitted a registered Lease Deed executed and registered on 07.08.2018 between the same lessor viz. Kamal Newar and the petitioner in respect of the same plot of land, for which the earlier Agreement of Lease dated 19.06.2018 was executed. He has submitted that at the relevant point of time, there was some difficulty at the office of the Circle Officer, Halem Revenue Circle, Halem in the month of June, 2018 in submission of application for No Objection Certificate for transfer of immovable property and the said fact is revealed from a letter dated 07.01.2019 of the Circle Officer, Halem Revenue Circle, Halem. He has further submitted that when after institution of the writ petition and issuance of notice to the respondent HPCL authorities, the respondent nos. 2, 3 & 4 had filed their affidavit-in-opposition on 08.03.2021, the petitioner came to learn that he was asked, on 09.09.2018, to submit a registered Lease Deed for an alternate plot of land as the FVC team who conducted the scrutiny of the documents submitted by the petitioner, found fault with the registered Deed submitted by the petitioner for godown and showroom for LPG distributorship for the subject-location. In the said affidavit, the respondent HPCL had further contended that by a letter dated 26.10.2018, the petitioner was informed that his candidature for LPG distributorship at the subject-location was rejected due to his failure in meeting the norms as regards the land documents for the subject-location. Projecting that the letter dated 26.10.2018 was not received by the petitioner, the learned Senior Counsel has submitted that the petitioner has to prefer an interlocutory application, I.A.[Civil] no. 965/2020 seeking amendment in the writ petition on the ground of emergence of such subsequent developments and new documents through the affidavit-in-opposition filed by the respondent nos. 2, 3 & 4. By the said interlocutory application, I.A.[Civil] no. 965/2020, the

petitioner has sought setting aside of the Re-Draw Notice dated 03.11.2018 as well as the letter dated 26.10.2018 whereby the candidature of the petitioner for LPG distributorship for the subject-location was rejected.

11. In response, Mr. Borthakur, learned counsel for the respondent nos. 2, 3 & 4 has submitted that on carrying out Field Verification of Credentials [FVC] by the FVC team, the land documents submitted by the petitioner were found not acceptable in terms of Clause I[w][b] r/w Clause 8[A][m] of the Brochure on Unified Selection Guidelines. He has submitted that the petitioner in his application, submitted on 24.06.2018 online, had made mention of the Agreement of Lease dated 19.06.2018 which, later on, turned out to be only a notarized deed. When the FVC team found discrepancies in the land documents submitted by the petitioner in connection with the plot of land offered by him for LPG distributorship, the petitioner was asked vide letters, dated 09.09.2018 & dated 20.09.2018, to submit either a registered Lease Deed for the offered plot of land or for an alternate plot of land, executed before the last date of submission of application i.e. 25.06.2018. He has further contended that the projection made in the writ petition as well as in the interlocutory application seeking amendment to the effect that the petitioner did not receive any intimation prior to issuance of the Re-Draw Notice dated 03.11.2018 is belied by the fact that the petitioner had himself wrote a letter to the respondent no. 2 on 08.10.2018 requesting the said authority to accept the registered Lease Deed executed by him with the lessor as he did not have any alternate land at the subject-location. As the Agreement for Lease dated 19.06.2018 mentioned by the petitioner in his application dated 24.06.2018 and the petitioner had executed the registered Lease Deed only on 07.08.2018 which was much later

than the last date of submission of application on 25.06.2018, the petitioner's selection in view of his failure to meet the norms laid down in the Unified Selection Guidelines had been rightly rejected by the respondent HPCL authorities and as such, the writ petition is bereft of any merit and does not call for any interference. In support of his submissions, he has referred to a decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal no. 6928-6929/2015 [Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited and others vs. Swapnil Singh], decided on 08.09.2015 and a decision of this Court in Mira Rani Sarkar vs. The Union of India and others, reported in 2021 3 GLT 809.

12. I have considered the rival submissions advanced by the learned counsel for the parties and also perused the materials on record brought by the parties through their pleadings, including the documents submitted by the petitioner in support of his candidature for LPG distributorship for the subject location, reference to which have been made by the learned counsel for the parties during the course of their submissions. Also perused the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Swapnil Singh [supra] and Mira Rani Sarkar [supra].

13. It appears apposite, at this stage itself, to take note of the background facts, in brief, involved in Swapnil Singh [supra]. Like in the case in hand, in Swapnil Singh [supra] also, applications for selection of regular LPG distributorships were invited in April, 2011 by the OMC, BPCL. One of the eligibility criteria was that the applicant should own a plot of land of adequate size and specific dimensions provided therein, on or before the date of application. The applicant should have ownership title of the property or

registered lease agreement for a minimum 15 years in the name of the applicant / family member as defined in multiple distributorship form of eligibility criteria. The respondent submitted an application on 13.09.2011, wherein by offering a plot of land, he mentioned the date of registration of the Sale Deed / Gift Deed / Lease Deed / Deed of Mutation as 13.09.2011. After the Draw of Lots on 30.03.2012, the respondent was found successful and on 19.02.2013, Field Verification of Credentials [FVC] was carried out to verify whether the respondent actually was the owner of the land or a lease holder as required by the Brochure. During the process of Field Verification of Credentials [FVC], it came to the knowledge of the BPCL authorities that the respondent had entered into the Lease Agreement only on 20.12.2012 for a period of 15 years and that Lease Agreement was registered only on 21.12.2012. It was, thus, found out during Field Verification of Credentials [FVC] that the respondent did not have a registered Lease Deed as on the date of application i.e. 13.09.2011. Having found so, the appellant BPCL authorities cancelled the allotment of the LPG distributorship to the respondent by a letter dated 11.06.2012.

13.1. Aggrieved thereby, the applicant, Swapnil Singh preferred a writ petition and ultimately, the matter reached the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India found that the respondent, Swapnil Singh had only a notarized Lease Agreement dated 13.09.2011 in his possession on the date of submission of his application on 13.09.2011. The registered Lease Deed came into existence only on 20.12.2012, which was registered on 21.12.2012. It was, therefore, observed that on the date of the application, the respondent therein was not eligible in terms of the Brochure and the application form since he only had a notarized Lease Deed dated 13.09.2011, instead of a registered

Lease Deed. The Hon'ble Supreme Court took note of the fact that Brochure and the application form were absolutely clear in the sense that the applicant must be the owner of the specified area of land or must have a registered Lease Deed of the specified area of land on the date of application. Accordingly, it was observed that the respondent was not eligible on the date of application i.e. 13.09.2011 and no fault was found with the decision regarding rejection of the candidature of the respondent therein taken by the respondent BPCL authorities.

14. The decision in Mira Rani Sarkar [supra] is also in similar lines.

15. Reverting back to the facts of the case in hand, it is found that the Brochure on Unified Selection Guidelines had inter alia set forth in clear and specific terms that the applicant must have a registered Lease Deed for the plot of land offered for godown / showroom of LPG distributorship having 15 years of valid lease period commencing on any date from the date of advertisement up to last date of submission of application as specified in the Advertisement. If the applicant was in a possession of a registered Lease Deed commencing on any date prior to the date of advertisement, his candidature would also be considered provided the lease was valid for a minimum of 15 years from the date of Advertisement.

16. A perusal of the Agreement for Lease stated to have been executed by the petitioner with the lessor, mentioned herein above, on 19.06.2018 goes to show that the same bore seal and signature of a Notary Public only and thus, the said

instrument is only a notarized agreement and it does not fall in the category of a registered Lease Deed Under Section 17 of the Registration Act, 1908, any lease of immovable property from year to year or for any term exceeding 1 [one] year is compulsorily registerable. The Unified Selection Guidelines in Clause 1[w] has provided for eligibility norms regarding 'ownership' or 'own' in respect of the plot of land offered for LPG distributorship in response to the Advertisement dated 25.05.2018. As per Clause 1[w][b], a candidate has to submit a registered Lease Deed having minimum 15 years of valid lease period commencing on any day from the date of the Advertisement [25.05.2018] up to the last date of submission of application as specified either in the Advertisement or Corrigendum, [if any] which was 25.06.2018. It was also clarified therein that the candidature of an applicant having registered Lease Deed commencing on any date prior to the date of Advertisement would also be considered provided the lease was valid for a minimum period of 15 years from the date of Advertisement. Clause 8[A][m] which was in conformity with Clause 1[w][b] stated that the applicant must 'own' a plot of land of capacity, minimum dimensions and at the subject-location on the last date of submission of application as specified either in the Advertisement or Corrigendum, if any, which in the instant case was 25.06.2018. The registered Lease Deed which the petitioner had executed with the lessor [Annexure-E6] to the writ petition was of 07.08.2018. From the said registered Lease Deed, it emerges that the Lease Deed was executed in pursuance of the permission issued by the Deputy Commissioner, Biswanath conveyed by a letter bearing no. NOC/35/568/2018-285 dated 03.08.2018. Though a contention has been advanced that the petitioner had approached the office of the Circle Officer, Halem Revenue Circle, Halem in the month of June, 2018 but the petitioner has failed to substantiate

the same by producing any copy of such application by which he had sought for No Objection Certificate for execution of the registered Lease Deed. The respondent HPCL authorities by annexing a copy of the letter dated 08.10.2018 stated to have been received from the petitioner, had contended that the petitioner had himself on 08.10.2018 had requested to accept his candidature as he had a registered Lease Deed by then. In absence of any denial from the end of the petitioner about the letter dated 08.10.2018, a clear inference can be drawn to the effect that the petitioner was well aware about the fact of his earlier last documents did not meet the eligibility criteria set forth in Guidelines for LPG distributorship for the subject-location.

17. From the above discussion, it has clearly emerged that on the last date of submission of the application i.e. 25.06.2018, the petitioner did not have any registered Lease Deed executed on any date prior to 25.06.2018 for a period of 15 years or more but had only a notarized Lease Deed. Therefore, it is evident that the petitioner did not fulfill the criteria of eligibility in respect of the plot of land offered for godown / showroom of LPG distributorship in terms of the Advertisement dated 25.05.2018 and the Unified Selection Guidelines for selection of LPG distributors. By execution of a registered Lease Deed subsequent to the last date of submission of application, the petitioner would not have acquired the eligibility. The observations made in Swapnil Singh [supra] and Mira Rani Sarkar [supra] are found applicable on all fours to the fact situation obtaining in the case in hand. In view of the same, even if the interlocutory application seeking amendment of the writ petition is allowed in the fact situation obtaining in the case, the same would not have improved the case of the petitioner in any manner. Rather, it would have delayed the process

of selection of LPG distributorship for the subject-location unnecessarily for the fact that the petitioner did not have the eligibility for the LPG distributorship for the subject-location on the last date of submission i.e. 25.06.2018. Thus, this Court does not find any good or sufficient reason to interfere with the decision of the HPCL authorities with regard to rejection of the candidature of the petitioner for LPG distributorship for the subject-location vide letter dated 26.10.2018.

18. In view of the above discussion and for the reasons assigned therein, the writ petition being devoid of any merit, stands dismissed. The interim order dated 19.11.2018 stands recalled. The interlocutor application, I.A.[Civil] no. 965/2020 is accordingly dismissed. The respondent HPCL authorities are at liberty to proceed with the process of selection of LPG distributorship at the subject-location from the stage of Re-Draw Notice dated 03.01.2018. There shall, however, be no order as to cost.

**JUDGE**

**Comparing Assistant**