

IN THE COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. 4988 /2015

(Saroj w/o Sewakbhan Waghaye vs. Union of India and another)

.....
Office Notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's orders
of directions and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's order

.....
Mr.R.M.Bhangde, Advocate for the petitioner
Mr. P.D. Meghe, Advocate for respondent no.2

**CORAM : SMT. VASANTI A. NAIK &
A.I.S.CHEEMA, JJ.**

DATED : 2nd September, 2015.

Heard.

By this petition, the petitioner impugns the order of the Senior Regional Manager of the Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited (henceforth abbreviated to "HPCL"), dated 13th April, 2015 informing the petitioner that all the actions taken by the HPCL in respect of scrutiny/ draw held/ re-draw held/ FVC completed are declared null and void and the respondent-HPCL will review the cases of the ineligible candidates.

Mr.PD.Meghe, the learned counsel for respondent-HPCL states that in view of the judgment of this Court, dated 9th October 2014, in a bunch of Writ Petitions bearing Writ Petition No.2812/2014 and others, the respondent-HPCL has decided to consider the claims of the candidates that have been declared ineligible in view of the reckoning of the lease period in the lease deeds submitted by them and the eligible

candidates like the petitioner and others would now be considered along with the candidates who were earlier held to be ineligible, but who would be found to be eligible in terms of the judgment, dated 9th October, 2014. It is stated that the question of re-deciding the eligibility of the petitioner would not arise as all the candidates that have been declared eligible earlier would be considered along with the candidates who were declared ineligible earlier, but who would be eligible in terms of the judgment, dated 9th October 2014. It is stated that the respondent HPCL is not desirous of issuing a fresh advertisement and the respondent-HPCL would only consider the eligibility of the candidates who are declared to be ineligible on the basis of the lease deed and then proceed to draw the lots.

Shri Bhangde, the learned counsel for the petitioner states that the grievance of the petitioner would not survive in view of the statement made by the learned counsel for the respondent, which would be binding on the HPCL.

In view of the aforesaid, we dispose of the Writ Petition by accepting the statement made on behalf of the respondent-HPCL, with no order as to costs.

JUDGE

JUDGE

safare