

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.18333 of 2013

=====

Veena, Devi Wife Of Sri Akhilesh Singh, Resident Of Village And P.O.
Shahwajpur Sarai, Police Station - Sitamadhi, District - Nawada

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The Union of India through Secretary, Ministry Of Petroleum, New Delhi
2. Indian Oil Corporation Limited through Its Managing Director, 3a, Maurya Lok Complex, Dak Bunglow Road, Patna
3. The General Manager, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Kisan Sewa Kendra, 3a, Maurya Lok Complex, Dak Bunglow Road, Patna
4. The Senior Divisional Retails Sales Manager, Patna Division Office, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, 3a, Maurya Lok Complex, Dak Bunglow Road, Patna
5. The Divisional Manager, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, 3a, Maurya Lok Complex, Dak Bunglow Road, Patna
6. Smt. Meera Kumari Wife of Sri Vijay Kumar Resident of Village - Panchu, Block and P.O. And P.S. Hisua, District - Nawada

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance:

For the Petitioner :	Mr. Rajesh Ranjan, Advocate
	Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, Advocate
For The Respondents:	Mr. Anil Kumar Sinha, Advocate
	Mr. Amlesh Kumar Verma, Advocate
	Mr. Abhimanyu Deo, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 14-08-2015

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the respondent Corporation.

2. Present writ petition has been filed for quashing the
result of evaluation for allocation of Kisan Sewa Kendra, i.e.
Rural Retail Outlet of Petrol/Diesel of Indian Oil Corporation at
village Manjhawe (on Manjhawe - Sitamarhi Road) in the district
of Nawada whereby the respondent no. 6 was wrongly declared
as the first in the list and the petitioner was relegated to second

position.



3. It is submitted on behalf of the petitioner that in the result of the evaluation on completion of the interview, the respondent no. 6 has been ranked as first and the petitioner has been ranked as second whereas the application of the respondent no. 6 was liable for rejection inasmuch as her document relating to residential status was forged and fabricated and for which a representation has been made by the petitioner before the respondent Corporation which however has been rejected. It is further submitted that the residential certificate of the respondent no. 6 is unreliable, as she habitually procures Voter I. Cards from different places where such dealerships are proposed. On this basis, she has submitted her application in the past variously claiming to be a resident of different places as found suitable.

4. Learned counsel for the respondent Corporation on the other hand appears and opposes the writ petition on the ground that such rejection of the petitioner's representation objecting to the residential certificate of the respondent no. 6 is in accordance with law, for the reason that the said residential certificate has duly been issued by the competent authority being the Circle Officer, Hisua Block, District Nalanda and thus acted upon.

5. Be that as it may, the writ petition is being disposed

of with consent of the parties granting liberty to the petitioner to approach the appropriate forum for redressal of his grievance with a fresh representation raising all points, which if filed within a period of one week hereof, shall be disposed of within a further period of three months thereafter in accordance with law.

6. The writ petition is disposed of accordingly.

(Vikash Jain, J)

Chandran

U			
---	--	--	--