

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9924 of 2011

=====

1. Satya Prakesh, S/o Vijay Kumar, Resident of R.P. Tower, 301, Frazer Road, P.S. Kotwali, District Patna

2. Narendra Kr. Singh, Son of Late Tej Narayan Singh, Resident of Village Kathua, P.O. Laknyma, P.S. Basaithi, District Araria

.... Petitioners

Versus

1. Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited through Its Chairman –cum- Managing Director, HPCL, Petroleum House 17 Jamshedji Tata Road, Mumbai-400020.

2. The Chairman cum Managing Director, HPCL, Petroleum House, 17 Jamshedji Tata Road, Mumbai – 400020.

3. The Zonal Manager (Retail), Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited, 6th, 7th, 8th Floors, North Tower, Core 2 Scop Minor District Centre, Laxminagar, Delhi -110092.

4. The Senior Regional Manager, Begusarai Retail Regional Office- C/o – Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited, Barauni Terminal, N.H.-31, At & P.O. Papraur, Begusarai.

5. National High Authority of India [N.H.A.I.] Dwarka, New Delhi.

6. The Chairman, National High Authority of India [N.H.A.I.] Dwarka, New Delhi.

7. Jai Prakash Gupta, Son of Sitaram Sah, Resident of Village Kasat, P.O. and P.S. Sikety, District Araria

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioners : None

For the Respondents : Mr. Rajeev Prakash, Advocate

For the NHAI : Mr. S.N. Pathak, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN
ORAL ORDER

3 01-10-2015 The present writ petition has been filed for setting aside the merit panel dated 20.01.2011 issued on the basis of interview held on 20.01.2011 in connection with the appointment of retail outlet dealership at N.H.-57, within five kilometers on L.H.S. from College Chowk of Farbesganj towards Araria which is mentioned at Sl. No.144 of the Tender floated by the Hindustan

Petroleum Corporation Limited.

2. None appears on behalf of the petitioners despite repeated calls.

3. Learned counsel for the respondent-Corporation, on the other hand, submits that the writ petition has now become infructuous as not only has the no objection certificate already been issued in favour of respondent no. 7, but even the Letter of Intent has been issued in his favour. Thereafter, a Dealership Agreement has also been signed by the said respondent no. 7 and the retail outlet has since been functioning since 2012 itself. None of these actions and developments have been challenged by the petitioners. It is, therefore, submitted that the writ petition has become infructuous.

4. Mr. S.N. Pathak, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent-NHAI, supports the stand of the respondent-Corporation.

5. Be that as it may, in view of non-appearance on behalf of the petitioners to press the writ petition, the same is dismissed for non-prosecution.

(Vikash Jain, J)

B.T/-

U			
---	--	--	--