

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.22853 of 2011

Priti Singh, wife of Pankaj Kumar Singh, Resident of Village & P.O. -
Biratpur, Police Station - Sonbarsaraj, District - Saharsa

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited, Bharat Bhawan 4 & 6
Currimbhoy Road, Ballard Estate, Mumbai, through its Chairman
2. The Regional Manager, Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd., 3rd
Floor, Ashiyana Chamber, Exhibition Road, Patna
3. Vibha Singh, wife of Dilip Kumar Singh, resident of Village & P.O. -
Biratpur, P.S. - Sonbarsaraj, District - Saharsa
4. Veena Singh, wife of Ranjan Kumar Singh, Resident of Village &
P.O. - Biratpur, Police Station - Sonbarsaraj, District - Saharsa

.... Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Natraj Verma, Adv.
Mr. R.K. Singh, Adv.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Sanjay Singh, Adv.
Mr. Vinod Kumar, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 27-04-2016

Learned counsel for the petitioner at the very outset
prays for permission to make appropriate corrections in the writ
petition wherever the reference to the respondent no. 3 has been
made as respondent no. 4 which has been inadvertent.

2. As prayed, the petitioner is permitted to make
appropriate corrections in the writ petition as above in course of

the day.

3. The present writ petition has been filed for quashing the "Statement Of Performance Of Candidates For Retail Outlet Dealership" chart dated 14.06.2011 as contained in Annexure-3 by which the respondent authority has allotted highest marks to the respondent no. 3 and declared her qualified under the heading 'outlet dealer of Biratpur' under the District of Saharsa, Bihar'; and for quashing the selection of the respondent no. 3 as retail outlet dealer of Bharat Petroleum pump of Biratpur (Rural) under the District of Saharsa for the reason that she does not fulfill the minimum essential criteria of land i.e. 35m x 35m (total 1225m²) required for the dealership of the said outlet; and for connected reliefs.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the respondent no. 3 had wrongly been selected as the empanelled candidate no. 1 for the retail outlet as she did not fulfill the requirement of the minimum land of 35m x 35m required to be offered in terms of the advertisement.

5. At the very outset, learned counsel for the respondents invites attention to the order of this Court dated 19.06.2012 passed in C.W.J.C. No. 2613 of 2012 wherein a similar challenge made by the respondent no. 4 of the present writ

petition was not entertained and this Court did not interfere with the selection of the respondent no. 3 after taking note that the latter had subsequently acquired extra land and had rectified the defect of shortfall.

6. In the facts and circumstances of the case and having regard to the nature of the order dated 19.06.2012 passed by this Court in C.W.J.C. No. 2613 of 2012 in similar circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant relief to the petitioner.

7. The writ petition stands dismissed.

(Vikash Jain, J)

Md. Ibrarul/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	03.05.2016
Transmission Date	