

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.22951 of 2011

=====

Anil Kumar Panjiar S/O Bharat Panjiar Resident of Village + P.O. + P.S. -
Baba Barhi, Distt. - Madhubani

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The Union of India through the Secretary, Department of Petroleum and Chemicals, New Delhi
2. Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited, through its Chairman cum - Managing Director Bharat Bhawan 4 and 6 Currombhay Road Ballard Estate, Mumbai - 400001
3. The Area Marketing Manager, Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd. 3rd Floor, Ashiana Chamber Exhibition Road, Patna - 800001
4. Territory Manager (Retail), Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd. at Paproul, P.S. Barauni, Distt.- Begusarai
5. Narayan Prasad Choudhary S/O Late Ram Bilas Choudhary Resident of Village + P.O. + P.S. - Babu Barhi, Distt.- Madhubani

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. HARI KUMAR THAKUR

For the UOI : Mr. RAGHIB AHSAN (ASST.SG)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 11-05-2016

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel
for the respondent Corporation.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for quashing the selection list of candidates prepared on 17.02.2009 at Area Marketing Office, Patna for selection of a dealer for Retail Outlet dealership of Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited at Babu Barhi in the District of Madhubani in so far it relates to the selection of Respondent no. 5; and for connected reliefs.

3. At the very outset this Court takes note that the impugned

selection list was prepared as far back as on 17.12.2009, pursuant to which the petitioner appears to have filed a complaint on 11.01.2010 within the stipulated 30 days period. However, since nothing was communicated thereafter to the petitioner, he has preferred this writ petition in December, 2011.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents makes a statement at the Bar that the retail outlet in question was commissioned on 30.04.2011 to the respondent no. 5 who has since been operating the same under the name and style "Choudhary Auto Service".

5. Having regard to the entirety of the facts and circumstances of the case, the delay on the part of the petitioner in approaching this Court for the relief sought, as well as the fact that the respondent no. 5 has been operating the retail outlet for more than five years, this Court is not inclined to enter into the merits of the claim of the petitioner at this belated stage, more so when the dispute relates to a contract matter.

6. The writ petition stands dismissed.

(Vikash Jain, J)

Chandran

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	13.05.2016
Transmission Date	