

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPC No. 3144 of 2016**

Prashant Kumar Agrawal S/o. Vijay Kumar Agrawal, Aged About 28
Years R/o. Raghupati Bhawan, Near Ram Mandir, Ward No. 7, Sakti,
District Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh) **---- Petitioner**

Versus

1. Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited A Government Of India,
Enterprises, Through : Its General Manager, 17 Jamshedji Tata Road,
Mumbai, Maharashtra.
2. Senior Regional Manager, Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited,
Madina Manjil, 2nd Floor, Medical College Road, Raipur, District Raipur
(Chhattisgarh)
3. General Manager, Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited, 771,
Anandpur, Opposite E M Bypass, Calcutta
4. Sub Divisional Officer, Public Works Department, Sakti, Division, Sakti,
District Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)
5. Chief Vigilance Officer, Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited,
Petroleum House 17, J. Tata Road, Church Gate, Mumbai,
Maharashtra.
6. Rishabh Agrawal, S/o. Vinod Kumar Agrawal, Aged About 24 Years
R/o. Ward No. 7, Near Ram Mandir, Hatri Road, Sakti, District Janjgir
Champa (Chhattisgarh)
7. Vinod Kumar Agrawal, S/o. Late Shankarlal Agrawal, Aged About 57
Years R/o. Ward No. 7, Near Ram Mandir, Hatri Road, Sakti, District
Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh) **---- Respondents**

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Manoj Paranjpe, Advocate,
For Respondent No. 1 to 3 & 5	:	Mr. Ali Asgar, Advocate
For Respondents No.6 & 7	:	Mr. Prateek Sharma, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava**Order On Board****06/04/2017**

Heard on admission.

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner assailing correctness and validity of decision taken by respondents company to hold the petitioner

disqualified and at the same time holding respondents No.6 & 7 qualified.

2. According to the petitioner, the land offered by the petitioner was within the stretch as advertised. Further according to the petitioner, the petitioner had already made a complaint parallelly to the Zonal Office that area should not be allowed for opening of rural outlet, the same ought to have also been taken into consideration.

3. Learned counsel for respondent Corporation submits that presently the Field Verification of Credentials has not taken place and in the meantime, the road abutting has been declared as State Highway, therefore, these matters would require consideration at appropriate level where these issues are pending.

4. Learned counsel for respondents No.6 & 7 submits that the petitioner had already participated in the proceeding for allotment without raising any objection with regard to the location but only when his candidature was rejected, he turned around to seek a direction on consideration of his complaint not to open any retail outlet at all, which the petitioner is estopped from challenging.

5. Be that as it may, in view of the statement which has been made, at the bar, by learned counsel for the Corporation that the matter on various issues are pending at appropriate level and Field Verification of Credentials is yet to be done, I think this matter can be disposed off at this stage allowing the respondents to take appropriate decision on the matters. If ultimately, the decision taken by respondent leads to any grievance of the parties, either of them would be at liberty to again approach this Court.

6. The petition is accordingly disposed off.

Sd/-
(**Manindra Mohan Shrivastava**)

J U D G E