

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.18943 of 2011

=====

Suneeta Singh wife of Yugal Kishore Singh, resident of village-Darauli, P.O. Darauli, P.S. Darauli, District- Siwan.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. M/s Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd., having its registered office at Bharat Bhawan, 4 & 6, Currimbhoy road, Ballard Estate, Post Box No. 688, Mumbai- 400001 through the General Manager.
2. The General Manager, M/s Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd., having its registered office at Bharat Bhawan, 4 & 6, Currimbhoy Road, Ballard Estate, Post Box No. 688, Mumbai-400001.
3. Area Marketing Manager, M/s Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd., 3rd Floor, Ashiana Chamber, Exhibition Road, Patna-800001 (Bihar).
4. Territory Manager (LPG), M/s Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd., Patna LPG Territory-cum-Bottling Plant, Fatuha Industrial Area, Mouza Raipura, P.O. & P.S. Fatuha, District- Patna.
5. Priyanka Singh, wife of Biresh Kumar, resident of Village-Chakra, P.O. Chakra, P.S. Siwan (Mufassil), District- Siwan.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Raju Giri, Adv.

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

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 27-04-2016

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the respondents.

2. The petitioner is aggrieved by the award of Letter of Intent issued to respondent no. 5 for LPG distributorship at Darauli, District- Siwan by the respondent Corporation.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner invites attention to paragraph-11 of the writ petition, stating that the respondent no. 5 was ineligible for being awarded the distributorship in view of Clause-8 of the advertisement which prohibits the grant of multiple dealership within a family Unit. It is stated that the husband of the

respondent no. 5 had already been awarded an LPG distributorship by the IOC.

4. While the respondent Corporation has not specifically answered this objection in its counter affidavit, the respondent no. 5 in paragraph-11 of her own counter affidavit has categorically and vehemently denied the petitioner’s allegation regarding her husband having any such LPG dealership.

5. Having regard to the stand of the parties and also to the fact that the petitioner has not refuted the stand of the respondent no. 5 as stated above, no rejoinder thereto having been filed on behalf of the petitioner, this petition being devoid of merit is dismissed.

(Vikash Jain, J)

Md. Ibrarul/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	04.05.2016
Transmission Date	