



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 16TH DAY OF JUNE, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

WRIT PETITION NO. 17544 OF 2026 (GM-RES)

BETWEEN:

SRI GOKUL P
S/O. PADMANABHA N.K,
AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS,
R/AT VENKATESHWARA COLONY,
RMC ROAD, MULBAGAL TOWN,
MULBAGAL TALUK,
KOLAR DISTRICT - 563 131.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. SHARATH S. GOWDA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. HINDUSTAN PETROLEUM CORPORATION LIMITED
(A GOVERNMENT OF INDIA ENTERPRISE)
REGISTERED OFFICE 17,
JAMSHEDJI TATA ROAD, MUMBAI - 400 020,
REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR.
2. HINDUSTAN PETROLEUM CORPORATION LIMITED
BANGALORE RETAIL REGIONAL OFFICE,
OFF/AT NO.77, OLD MADRAS ROAD,
DOORVANI NAGAR POST, K R PURAM,
BENGALURU - 560 016
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGIONAL OFFICE HEAD.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. PRAMOD B, ADVOCATE FOR R1 AND R2)



THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO A. ISSUE WRIT IN THE NATURE OF CERTIORARI OR ANY OTHER APPROPRIATE WRIT TO QUASH/SET ASIDE THE IMPUGNED COMMUNICATION DATED 20.05.2026 IN REF. NO. HPC1697198526841 ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.2 VIDE ANNEXURE-A AND ETC.,

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

ORAL ORDER

1. Sri Pramod B, learned counsel accepts notice for respondent Nos.1 and 2.
2. Petitioner is before this Court seeking for the following reliefs:
 - a. *Issue writ in the nature of Certiorari or any other appropriate writ to quash/set aside the Impugned Communication dated 20.05.2026 in Ref. No. HPC1697198526841 issued by the Respondent No.2 vide Annexure-A.*
 - b. *Issue writ in the nature of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ in directing the Respondent No.2 to allot a retail outlet dealership at Thippadoddi village within 1Km from the Andhra Pradesh Border to the Petitioner.*
 - c. *Grant such other relief this Hon'ble court deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.*



3. An advertisement inviting application for establishment of a Retail Outlet Dealership was issued by respondent No.2 in terms whereof the location was earmarked to be in Thippadoddi Village within 1 kilometre from the Andhra Pradesh border towards Thippadoddi Village, Mulbagal Taluk, Kolar District, Karnataka under the OBC category.
4. The petitioner having applied for the same, his application came to be rejected vide the order dated 20.05.2026 on the ground that the land is not in the advertised stretch. It is challenging the same, the petitioner is before this Court.
5. The submission of Sri Sharath S. Gowda, learned counsel for the petitioner is that though the land of the petitioner is not situated in Thippadoddi Village, but it is situated in Ugani Village, Byrakur Hobli, Mulbagal Taluk, Kolar District.
6. His submission is that the said plot is located on the Thippadoddi road, which is stated to be located on the western portion of the property of the petitioner, and as such, this plot ought to have been accepted by the



respondents, taking into account the purpose of issuance of the notification being to service the people using the said road.

7. His submission is that the location of the property is more or less similar to that of the petitioner, which would have been located in Thippadoddi Village, and as such, the rejection made by the respondents is not proper.
8. Heard Sri. Sharath S. Gowda, learned counsel for the petitioner and perused papers.
9. From such perusal, it is clear that the applications were invited for Retail Outlet Dealership for a property located in Thippadoddi Village within 1 kilometer from the Andhra Pradesh border towards Thippadoddi Village, Mulbagal Taluk, Kolar District.
10. Once a specific reference has been made to the location of the property, it is but required that only the people who satisfy that requirement could make such an application. The interpretations ought to be offered by learned counsel for the petitioner that the purpose would



be achieved by this plot cannot be accepted since that would allow interpretation of a sacrosanct clause of the tender notification, which specifies the location of the Retail Outlet dealership.

11. If such an interpretation were to be accepted after the publication were to be made, then there would be several other persons who could probably be situated similarly, who would not have applied because of the specific location of the dealership. The petitioner cannot now seek to take advantage of his making an application though not satisfying the requirement of the notification and contend that the purpose would be achieved.
12. The location being specified categorically, it is only the properties which are located and which satisfy the requirement of that notification which can be considered for the purpose of the grant of Retail Outlet dealership. The petitioner's property admittedly being in Ugani Village and not in Thippadoddi Village does not satisfy the requirement.



13. Therefore, no infirmity can be found with the order passed by the respondent authorities, the petition is ***dismissed.***

Sd/-
(SURAJ GOVINDARAJ)
JUDGE

GJM
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 8