

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.13131 of 2014

=====

1. Kumari Nidhi Kumari @ Nidhi Kumari daughter of Rabindra Pandey Resident of village - Sendurkha, P.O. Sohil Patti, P.S. Basantpur, District - Siwan.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Ltd., 17 Jamshedji Tata Road, Mumbai through the Chairman.
2. The Chairman, Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Ltd., 17, Jamshedji Tata Road, Mumbai.
3. The General Manager, Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Ltd., 17, Jamshedji Tata Road, Mumbai.
4. The Deputy General Manager, Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Ltd., North Central Zone, Plot No. 1, Nehru Enclave, Gomati Nagar, Lucknow.
5. The Chief Manager (NWP), Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Ltd., North Central Zone, Plot No. 1, Nehru Enclave, Gomati Nagar, Lucknow.
6. The Deputy Manager (Incharge) Legal, Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Ltd., North Central Zone, Plot No. 1, Nehru Enclave, Gomati Nagar, Lucknow.
7. The Senior Regional Manager, Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Ltd., Patna Retail Region, 6th Floor, Lok Nayak Jai Prakash Bhawan, Dak Bunglow Chawraha, Patna.
8. Smt. Priyanka Singh wife of Sri Sunil Kumar Singh Resident of village and P.O. Bansohi, P.S. Mashrakh, District - Saran at Chapra.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Chandan, Adv.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Rajeev Prakash, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 22-02-2016

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the respondents.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for quashing the letter dated 18.06.2014 issued under the joint signature of the Respondent Nos. 4, 5, and 6 and contained in letter No. DS/GMO/PRR/016 dated 18.06.2014, whereby and whereunder the complaint of the petitioner against her under

evaluation on different scores has been rejected by the Respondents and at the same time the petitioner's complaint against arbitrary valuation of the Respondent No. 8 on different counts has been rejected and her evaluation has been justified after receiving further documents from the Respondent No. 8 and for connected reliefs.

3. At the very outset, learned counsel for the respondent Corporation submits that the writ petition has now become infructuous. According to the provisional merit panel prepared by the Corporation, the respondent no. 8 stood at serial no. 1 with 74.34% marks while the petitioner was placed at serial no. 2 with 70.61 marks. On the complaint of the petitioner during the pendency of the writ petition against the respondent no. 8, the matter was investigated and by the Corporation's letter dated 02.11.2015 the empanelment of the respondent no. 8 has been cancelled due to suppression and/or misrepresentation of materials facts and submission of tampered lease deed. It is therefore submitted that the petitioner has now been elevated to serial no. 1.

4. In the above view of the matter, the writ petition stands disposed.

(Vikash Jain, J)

Md. Ibrarul/-

U			
---	--	--	--