

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7255 of 2014

=====

Saroj Kumar Ram Son of Late Jagnarayan Ram, resident of village- Indour, Police Station- Dinara, District- Rohtas, Bihar- 802213

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The General Manager, Indian Oil Corporation Bihar State Office Lok Nayak Jai Prakash Bhawan, 5th Floor Dakbanglow Chowk, Patna-1
2. Chief Area Manager, Indian Oil Corporation Ltd., 1st Floor, Shahi Bhawan, Exhibition Road, Patna- 800001.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Singh, Advocate

For the Respondents: Mr. Anil Kumar Sinha

Mr. Abhimanyu Deo, Advocates

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 21-01-2016

The present writ petition has been filed for directing the respondents to make allotment of Rajiv Gandhi Gramin LPG Vitrak (for short, "RGGLV) at Chitawan, Andaur, Rohtas for reserved Scheduled Caste category pursuant to advertisement dated 26.02.2012 and cancellation of the second advertisement dated 28.06.2013.

2. It appears that the petitioner applied in the Scheduled Caste category for allotment of the distributorship for the location Chitawan pursuant to advertisement dated 26.02.2012 and submitted requisite documents with the application. Thereafter by letter dated 13.09.2012, the respondent-Corporation required re-submission of Annexure-C as well as clarification of land ownership. In due course, a fresh advertisement was issued when the petitioner applied thereunder

in the open category and has been selected for draw.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there was no justification for cancelling the earlier advertisement dated 26.02.2012 while in the same breath, selecting the petitioner under the subsequent advertisement dated 28.06.2013 based on the very same documents as submitted earlier.

4. Learned counsel for the respondent-Corporation, on the other hand, submits that the earlier advertisement dated 26.02.2012 was abandoned and no allotment thereunder was made.

5. Having regard to the nature of the prayer made by the petitioner, this Court does not find any merit in the writ petition as the petitioner has failed to demonstrate that any prejudice whatsoever has been caused to the petitioner by the action of the Corporation in having selected him, not under the first advertisement, but under the subsequent advertisement.

6. In the above view of the matter, the writ petition stands dismissed.

(Vikash Jain, J)

B.T/-

U			
---	--	--	--