

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH AT NAGPUR

WRIT PETITION NO.1823/2016

Dilip Annaji Raut

...Versus...

State of Maharashtra, through its Secretary, Ministry of Petroleum, Mantralaya,
Mumbai and others

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Shri C.A. Babrekar, Advocate for petitioner
Mrs. R.A. Deshpande, AGP for respondent no.1

CORAM : SMT. VASANTI A. NAIK AND
V.M. DESHPANDE, JJ.

DATE : 15.03.2016

By this writ petition, the petitioner challenges the allotment of L.P.G. dealership in favour of the respondent no.3.

The petitioner claims to be a resident of village Asatpur in Taluka Achalpur, District Amravati, where the L.P.G. dealership was required. By an advertisement dated 13.12.2013, the respondent no.2 – Oil Company invited applications from candidates desirous of securing L.P.G. dealership. After considering the applications and the requirements as per the eligibility criteria, the respondent no.3 was allotted the L.P.G. dealership. The petitioner made a complaint against the allotment of L.P.G. dealership in favour of the respondent no.3 to the respondent no.2 – Oil Company but the said complaint was

rejected on the ground that it was filed more than 30 days from the date of declaration of the results of the draw. In this background, the petitioner has approached this Court seeking the cancellation of the L.P.G. dealership in favour of the respondent no.3. According to the petitioner, the place earmarked for the godown of L.P.G. dealership is not convenient for supplying the gas cylinders in Asatpur village. It is the case of the petitioner that the godown appears to have been located in an agricultural field and hence, it would not be possible for the respondent no.3 to conveniently distribute the L.P.G. cylinders from the said godown.

On hearing the learned Counsel for the parties, we find that the petitioner does not have a *locus standi* to file the writ petition. The petitioner has not applied for L.P.G. dealership in pursuance of the advertisement issued by the respondent no.2. Whether the godown of the respondent no.3 is located at a convenient place or not is not for the petitioner to decide. The respondent no.2 has rightly declined to entertain the complaint at the behest of the petitioner, more so, when it was filed belatedly.

In the absence of any *locus standi* to file the writ petition, we dismiss the petition with no order as to costs.

JUDGE

JUDGE