

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO.8195 OF 2014**

Satish Ramchandra Sakunde

...Petitioner

Versus

Hindustan Petrolia Corporation
Ltd. & Ors.

...Respondents

...

Mr. S.S. Prabhune for the Petitioner.

Mr. Minoo Siodia i/b. M/s. Rustomji and Giniwala for Respondent
Nos.1 and 2.

Mr. V.M. Mali, A.G.P. for Respondent Nos. 3 to 6.

Mr. Y.P. Narvankar i/b. Mr. P.N. Joshi for Respondent No.7

**CORAM : RANJIT MORE &
SMT. ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, JJ.**

DATED : 1st AUGUST, 2016.

P. C. :

Heard the learned counsels appearing for the respective
parties.

2. By this petition, filed under Article 226 of the Constitution
of India, the Petitioner is challenging selection of Respondent No.7 as
the LPG distributor of Respondent No.1.

3. The Respondent No.1 issued an advertisement dated 29th
September, 2013 for inviting applications for appointment of regular

LPG distributorship at Someshwarnagar, Taluka-Baramati, District-Pune, under OBC category. The Petitioner, Respondent No.7 and others submitted application forms. The Respondent No.7 was selected in a draw, which was drawn on 3rd July, 2014.

4. The Petitioner objected selection of Respondent No.7 on the ground that land owned by him, which is used for LPG Distributorship is not coming in the location given in the advertisement. He had also filed complaint with Respondent No.1 to that effect. Pursuant to this complaint Respondent No.1 called for report from the Tahasilda/ Revenue Officer. Respondent No.1 inspected the property of Respondent No.7 and enquired into the allegations made by the Petitioner in this regard. The Respondent No.1 found that the land / showroom building of Respondent No.7 is located in Someshwarnagar area. The verification report is on record, which supports the contention of the learned counsel for Respondent No.7. Perusal of the report shows that the location/ showroom building of Respondent No.7 is in the advertised location i.e. Someshwarnagar.

5. In above circumstances, there is no merit in the petition, same is dismissed.

6. The learned counsel for the Petitioner, at this stage requests for continuation of ad-interim stay. Since we find the objection raised by the Petitioner is frivolous one, the prayer is rejected.

(ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, J.)

(RANJIT MORE, J.)