

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.5753 of 2014

=====

Anand Kumar Son Of Krishna Paswan @ Kishun Dusadh, resident of Village-
Sunderpur Barja, P.O.- Sunderpur Barja, P.S.- Bihiya, District- Bhojpur, Bihar

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union of India through the Secretary, Ministry Of Petroleum New Delhi
2. The Indian Oil Corporation Limited Through The Managing Director, Bihar State Office, Lok Nayak Jai Prakash Bhawan, 5th Floor, Dak Bunglowchowk, Patna-1
3. The Chief Area Manager, I.O.C. Ltd., Patna Area Office, 1st Floor Shahi Bhawan Exhibition Road, Patna-1 Null P.S. Gandhi Maidan, Disttt.- Patna
4. The Assistant Manager, I.O.C. Ltd., (Lpg-S), Patna 11 Lsa Patna Area Office 1st Floor Shahi Bhawan Exhibition Road, Patna, P.S. Gandhi Maidan, Disttt.- Patna

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Krishnadeo Rai, Advocate.
Mr. Sheo Kumar Nand, Advocate.

For the Respondent/s : M/s. Kanak Verma, C.G.C.
Mr. Anil Kumar Sinha, Advocate.
Mr. Abhimanyu Deo, Advocate.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 18-01-2016

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the respondents.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for quashing
the letter No. PT/RGGLV/91/03 dated 15.01.2014 issued under the
signature of Chief Area Manager, Patna Area Office Indian Oil
Corporation Ltd., Exhibition Road, Patna by which letter the
candidature of petitioner for award of Rajiv Gandhi LPG Vitrak
(RGGLV) of Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. (MD) at Pipra, Suderpur
Barja, District- Bhojpur category SC has not been found suitable.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner's case ought not to have been rejected as there was an approach road for the offered plot which had been taken on lease for a period of 20 years from the owner Subhash Rai.

4. Learned counsel for the Railways, on the other hand, submits that according to Policy Guidelines, the approach road was required to be in the name of the applicant whereas in the instant case the petitioner himself has pleaded in para-9 of the writ petition that the approach road belonged to one Subhash Rai from whom he had taken the same on lease. It is therefore submitted that the petitioner did not satisfy the requirement in this regard.

5. Having heard the parties and on consideration of the materials on record, this Court does not find any merit in the writ petition as the approach road in question admittedly did not belong to the petitioner and the Policy Guidelines cannot be said to have been fulfilled. The writ petition accordingly stands dismissed.

(Vikash Jain, J)

Md. Ibrarul/-

U			
---	--	--	--