

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPC No. 1133 of 2016

1. Sangeeta Khandelwal W/o Shri Goverdhan Khandelwal, Aged About 47 Years, R/o 15/ 181, Opp. Kirodimal Dharamshala, Raipur, Civil And Revenue Distt. Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. Indian Oil Corporation Ltd Through Its General Manager, India Oil Bhawan, Jail Road, Arera Hills, P.S. Arera, Bhopal (Madhya Pradesh)
2. Senior Divisional Retail Sales Manager, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Rajeev Gandhi Marg, Telibandha, VIP Road, Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondent

For Petitioner	Shri Ali Asgar, Advocate
For Respondents	Shri Anand Shukla, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order On Board

29/04/2016

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner assailing the correctness and validity of the communication dated 19.09.2013 by which the petitioner was informed that the entire process of selection has been cancelled and the respondent-Indian Oil Corporation Limited has decided to initiate the process afresh.

2. With regard to maintainability of the petition on the ground of delay and laches, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the other candidate of the selection process namely, Shri Kishore Kumar Saharia has earlier filed a writ petition bearing WPC No.448/2013, which is still pending consideration before this Court. He submits that during pendency of the said writ petition, the petitioner kept making representations to the respondent authorities to consider the petitioner's candidature, which are still pending without any decision. When nothing was done, this petition has been filed.
3. I am afraid that the grounds urged by the learned counsel for the petitioner do not constitute sufficient for the purpose of entertaining this writ petition. The decision was taken by the respondent No.1 to cancel the entire process way back on 19.09.2013, which was duly communicated to the petitioner. Despite knowing the same, the petitioner chose not to challenge the same for the last about 2½ years. Pendency of a petition filed by other candidate, would not provide an explanation in the aid of the petitioner to seek indulgence of this Court.
4. In view of the above, this writ petition is liable to be and is hereby dismissed at the motion stage itself on the ground of delay and laches.

Sd/-

MANINDRA MOHAN SHRIVASTAVA

JUDGE

Gowri