

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9456 of 2011

=====

Kamini Singh, Wife of Arun Kumar Singh, Resident of Mohalla- Ward No. 2, P.O. - Forbesganj, P.S- Faorbesganj, District - Araria

.... Petitioner

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. The Chairman, National Highways Authority of India (N.H.A.I) Dwarka, New Delhi

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

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondents : Mr. Rajeev Prakash, Advocate

For the NHA I : Mr. S.N. Pathak, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN
ORAL ORDER

4 01-10-2015 The present writ petition has been filed for setting aside the letter dated 26.04.2011 issued by the respondent-HPCL whereby the complaint/objection filed by the petitioner against the marks of performance 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 [for short H.P.C.L.] on 11.06.2010, has been closed.

2. None appears on behalf of the petitioner 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. 6, 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. 6 and the retail outlet has since been functioning since 2012 itself. None of these actions and developments have been challenged by the petitioner. 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 petitioner to press the writ petition, the same is dismissed for non-prosecution.

(Vikash Jain, J)

B.T/-

U			
---	--	--	--