

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh.

**CWP No.8290 of 2015
Decided on 25.1.2016**

Pardeep Kumar

--Petitioner

Vs.

Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd. and another

--Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR JAIN

Present: Mr. Vijay Pal, Advocate, for the petitioner

Mr. Raman Sharma, Advocate, for respondent No.1

Rakesh Kumar Jain,J: (Oral)

The petitioner has challenged the communication/order dated 04.3.2015 of the Bharat Petroleum Corporation (for short, the Corporation) by which the candidature of the petitioner was rejected and the amount of ₹25,000/-deposited with the Corporation was forfeited in line with clause No.16-h of the advertisement because the petitioner did not supply the registered lease deed and had relied upon the notorized rent agreement.

Learned counsel for the respondents has produced on record the order dated 18.8.2015 passed by the Supreme Court in the case of **Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd. Ors Vs. Apnil Singh** in which similar issue

was involved as the Calcutta High Court had allowed the petition of the respondents on the basis of notorized rent agreement but the Apex Court has held that since the requirement in the advertisement is of registered lease deed, therefore, it cannot be replaced by notorized rent agreement.

In view of the law laid down by the Apex Court, I do not find any merit in this petition and the same is hereby dismissed.

25.1.2016
rr

(Rakesh Kumar Jain)
Judge