

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

(1) WP NO.2602/2014

9 WRIT PETITION NO. 2602 OF 2014

TEJASHREE GURUDATTA PATIL
VERSUS
THE UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

...
Advocate for Petitioner : Mr.Bhokarikar Madhav M
Mr.Katneshwarkar P.R., Adv., for R/4.
Mr. S.D.Kulkarni and Mr. S.S.Kulkarni, Adv., for respondent nos. 2
and 3.

...
CORAM : R. M. BORDE & P.R. BORA, JJ.
Dated: July 29, 2015

...
PER COURT :-

1. The petitioner is objecting to selection of respondent No.4 for being appointed as a Distributor of Liquefied Petroleum Gas (for short 'LPG'). According to petitioner, respondent no.4 does not fulfill the requirement laid down under clause 11 of the advertisement which prescribes that the place for the godown or the showroom cited by the candidate shall be within periphery of 500 meters and that the same shall be in the same village. According to petitioner, respondent no.4 does not fulfill the requirement laid down under the aforesaid clause. It has been pointed out that clause 11 recorded in the advertisement is ambiguous and, as such, a clarification was published by the Petroleum Company by issuing a corrigendum clarifying that the distance between the godown and showroom shall be less than 500 meters. The petitioner's contention appears to be that the godown and the showroom are situated beyond 3 kms from village

agp/-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

(2)

WP NO.2602/2014

and, as such, the candidature of respondent no.4 ought to have been rejected.

2. Learned Counsel appearing for the Petroleum Company contends that the selection of respondent no.4 is made since it was observed that he fulfills all the requirements prescribed under the advertisement and that there is no breach of any of the conditions much less the condition as pointed out by the petitioner. The petitioner has not disputed that his candidature has been rejected by the Petroleum Company since he was not found eligible, and that there is no room for raising any grievance in respect of selection of respondent no.4.

In this view of the matter, in exercise of extraordinary writ jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, no interference is called for. The petition is devoid of substance and stands rejected.

(P.R. BORA, J.)

(R. M. BORDE, J.)

...