

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3380 of 2014

=====

1. Prabhunath Ram Son Of Late Asarfi Ram Resident Of Village- Bhagauchha,
P.O.- Pipra, P.S.- Maharajganj, District- Siwan

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Indian Oil Corporation Limited Through Its Chairman, New Delhi
2. The General Manager, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Shahi Bhawan,
Exhibition Road, Patna
3. The Deputy General Manager (C.S.), Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Lok
Nayak Jai Prakash Bhawan, Dak Bungalow Chowk, Patna
4. The Ch. Area Manager, Indane Area Office, Patna
5. The Deputy Manager (Lpg-S), Indane Area Office, Shahi Bhawan, Exhibition
Road, Patna
6. Jai Kishor Kumar Son Of Sri Jhakkar Manjhi Resident Of Village- Bhagauchha,
P.S.- Maharajganj, District- Siwan
7. The State Of Bihar
8. The District Magistrate, Siwan
9. The Circle Officer, Daraunda, Block- Daraunda, District- Siwan

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. RAVINDRA NATH DUBEY

For the Respondent/s : Mr. LALIT KISHOR

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 15-12-2015

1. Heard the parties.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for quashing the letter dated 20.01.2014 issued under the signature of Respondent no. 4 and further direct the respondents to re-examine the complain filed by the petitioner after verification of the plot and cancel the selection of the Respondent No. 6 and further direct the Respondents to conduct a fresh lottery for the RGGLV Location, Baguchha, District Siwan and after enquiry decide the matter afresh.

3. It is submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the land offered by the respondent no. 4 is measured 22.7 in width, which fell short of the requirement of the Advertisement.

4. Learned senior counsel for the Corporation as well as the private respondent have opposed the writ petition and submitted that no illegality has been committed in the award of the distributorship in favour of the respondent no. 4. The writ petition is on the face of it frivolous.

5. A bare perusal of the advertisement discloses that the minimum requirement with regard to the land was 21 meters x 26 meters whereas the impugned letter dated 20.01.2014 states that the land offered by respondent no. 4 measured 23.18 meters x 34.16 meters and thus such land appropriately met the requirements of the advertisement. This aspect has not been disputed by the petitioner.

6. In above view of the matter, this Court finds no merit in the writ petition, which accordingly, stands dismissed.

(Vikash Jain, J)

Prakash/-

U			
---	--	--	--