

**THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CWP No. 7833 of 2001 (O&M)
Date of decision: January 20, 2015

Narinder Kumar Gupta

...Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

1. **Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?**
2. **To be referred to the Reporters or not ?**
3. **Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?**

Present: Mr. Kriteka, Advocate, for
Mr. Kapil Kakkar, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Atul Gaur, Advocate, for
Mr. Sumeet Goel, Advocate,
for respondents No.2 and 3.

Mr. Kunal Mulwani, Advocate,
for respondent No.4.

K. KANNAN, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner's grievance in the manner of allotment of a petrol outlet was that he was higher in the order of merit as regards the income status and the experience. The 4th respondent was merely 21 years of age and had no experience at all. The petitioner had given a representation seeking for information regarding how the relative appraisal has been done, but the petitioner was not given the information by the Petroleum Corporation.

2. The matter relates to an advertisement issued on 21.7.2000 and the interview that was held on 20.4.2001. In the first place, it will be

grossly inexpedient to allow for fresh consideration at this length of time. In any event, the counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents states that the matter of allotments made at various places by the Oil Companies, there had been widespread reports of irregularities and a batch of writ petitions were filed before the Supreme Court and the case stood consideration in the case titled as Onkar Lal Bajaj Vs. Union of India 2003 (2) SCC 673. The Bench had ordered a Committee to be formed and secure information of all the details of the various allottees on a case to case basis and identify the cases where there have been irregularities. There were 470 allottees in all, whose names were exposed as tainted after a probe. It appears that the allotment to the 4th respondent, which was one of the cases examined, was found to be not so tainted. I shall let the matter reside there and not open for consideration whether experience factor was appropriately considered or not. I will not find the intervention at this time as appropriate and I decline to make any intervention in favour of the petitioner.

3. The writ petition is dismissed.

January 20, 2015
prem

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE