

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C.PRAVEEN KUMAR

W.P.No.28323 OF 2008

ORDER:

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Standing Counsel appearing for respondent No.1, and perused the record.

2. This writ petition is filed seeking to issue *Rule Nisi* calling for the records leading upto and inclusive of the proceedings of respondent No.1 in Ref.JV/LPG, dated 15.12.2008, and quash the same by issuing a writ, order or direction in the nature of Certiorari.

3. The averments in the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition are as under:

Pursuant to an advertisement in Deccan Chronicle, dated 01.10.2007, calling for applications to Award L.P.G. Distributorship of H.P.C.L., at Gajapathinagaram, the petitioner sent an application fulfilling all the requirements as mentioned in the said paper. He was called for interview by the Selection Committee on 13.10.2008. After evaluating the merits and demerits, a list of empanelled candidates for H.P.Gas Distributorship at Gajapathinagaram was prepared out of the six applicants. The petitioner and respondent No.2 were interviewed by a Selection Committee consisting of three members. The three members of the Selection Committee gave him 53.56 marks out of 140 marks whereas respondent No.2 was awarded 52.79 marks out of 140 marks. As per the said panel, the name of the petitioner appears at No.1 having got the maximum number of marks.

It is stated that due to political pressure and recommendations, respondent No.1 gave go-bye to the interview conducted by the Selection Committee in which the petitioner was placed at No.1 in the

order of merit and by proceedings in Ref.JV/LPG, dated 15.12.2008, superceeded the earlier results declared on 13.10.2008 on ground that a complaint was received from respondent No.2 with regard to marks obtained by the petitioner on DC/PMP category.

4. When the matter is taken up for hearing, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that respondent No.2 lodged a complaint against the petitioner herein regarding getting less marks on DC/PMP category. The enquiries made on such complaint revealed that the allegations made against the petitioner are true. Hence, respondent No.2 was appointed as a distributor instead of the writ petitioner, but since respondent No.2 also did not show any interest in accepting the distributorship, a fresh notification was issued on 15.9.2013 for setting up of the L.P.G. Distributorship at Gajapathinagaram, which is for the same location where the first advertisement was given.

5. In view of the above, learned counsel for the petitioner accepts that nothing survives for adjudication in this writ petition. Hence, this Writ Petition is closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

6. Miscellaneous Petitions pending, if any, in this writ petition shall stand closed.

JUSTICE C.PRAVEEN KUMAR

Date: 28.12.2015
AMD

-

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C.PRAVEEN KUMAR

-
-
-
-
-

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

-
-
-

W.P.No.28323 OF 2008

-
-
-
-

-

DATE: 28.12.2015

AMD