

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT HYDERABAD
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AND THE STATE OF ANDHRA
PRADESH**

-

W.P.No. 16995 of 2015

Between:

M/s. Prasannanjaneya Filling Station

... Petitioner

and

Indian Oil Corporation Ltd and another

... Respondent/s

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 6.11.2015

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

- | | | |
|---|--|----|
| 1 | Whether Reporters of Local
newspapers may be allowed to see
the Judgments? | No |
| 2 | Whether the copies of judgment may
be marked to Law Reports/Journals | No |
| 3 | Whether Their Ladyship/Lordship
wish to see the fair copy of the
Judgment? | No |

-

-

-

-

-

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

-
W.P. NO. 16995 of 2015

-
ORDER:

Heard Mr. L. Ravichander, learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned standing counsel appearing for the respondents.

This writ petition is directed against the action of the respondents in not allowing the petitioner to operate and continue to run his retail outlet in view of the inspection report dated 19.2.2015. Subsequent to the inspection report, the petitioner was also given a show-cause notice dated 24.3.2015 informing him of the variations noticed in the inspection report dated 19.2.2015 and was required to submit his explanation. As a preventive measure, supplies/sales to the petitioner's retail outlet were suspended and the outlet was closed. The petitioner also approached this Court earlier in W.P.No. 9288 of 2015 which was disposed of by this Court on 20.4.2015 after noting down the representation on behalf of the learned standing counsel for the Corporation that the petitioner's explanation was being considered and appropriate decision will be informed to the petitioner. However, no decision having been taken and communicated to the petitioner and suspension of supplies/sales cannot be continued beyond 15 days as per the Marketing Discipline Guidelines, the present writ petition is filed.

Though as many as ten adjournments have been granted in this writ petition requiring the learned standing counsel for the respondents to report if any final order was passed. Even today it is reported that no final order was passed.

Since the supplies/sales to the petitioner's outlet cannot be suspended indefinitely, I deem it appropriate to dispose of this writ

petition directing the respondents to continue the supplies/sales to the petitioner's retail outlet and permit the petitioner to run the retail outlet as before.

This order, however, will not preclude the respondents from considering the explanation of the petitioner and passing appropriate orders in pursuance of the show-cause notice.

The writ petition is accordingly disposed of. Miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed. No order as to costs.

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J

Dt. 6.11.2015

KR