

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2627 of 2017

=====

Niranjan Kumar Singh, S/o Lallan Singh, R/o village - Pakaria, P.O. + P.S.
Akorhigola, District - Rohtas

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The Union of India, through the Secretary, Department of Petroleum, Govt. of India, New Delhi
2. The Secretary, Department of Petroleum, Govt. of India, New Delhi
3. The Territory Manager (Retail) Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited, Patna
Retail Territory Office AT/PO - Pakri, Via - Anishaad, District - Patna
4. The State Head (Retail), Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited, State Head
Office, Ashiana Chamber, 3rd Floor, Exhibition Road, Post Box No. 20, Patna
800001
5. Smt. Alka Singh, W/o Abhishek Kumar Singh, R/o village - Khapra, P.O. +
P.S. Akorhigola, District - Rohtas

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ashutosh Tripathy, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Madhuresh Prasad, Adv.
Mr. Om Prakash Kumar, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVAJI PANDEY

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 21-04-2017

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

In the present case, the petitioner is challenging the allotment of Retail Outlet Dealership at Karkatpur Block-Akorhigola, District-Rohtas in favour of private respondent No.7 on the ground that the one Rajesh Singh has executed the lease deed of Plot No.533 Khata No.105, area 24.025 decimal in favour of her husband namely, Abhishek Kumar Singh, later on by



notarized affidavit he has cancelled the lease deed and executed another lease deed in favour of Alka Singh.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits the manner in which the lease deed has been executed is not permitted in the law.

This part of argument of learned counsel for the petitioner is correct, but looking to the intimate relationship between Abhishek Kumar Singh and Alka Singh as wife and husband, it is very difficult for this Court to exercise the discretion in favour of the petitioner. Further, the petitioner has raised his grievance before the Committee and the Committee vide order dated 19.01.2017 has rejected the complaint of the petitioner.

In such view of the matter, this Court does not find any merit in this writ application. Accordingly, this writ application is dismissed.

(Shivaji Pandey, J)

pawan/-

AFR/NAFR	N.A.F.R.
CAV DATE	N/A.
Uploading Date	26.04.2017
Transmission Date	N/A.

