

CWP No.17772 of 2014

[1]

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

**CWP No.17772 of 2014
Date of decision:25.07.2017**

Ritu ...Petitioner

Versus

Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. and another ...Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rakesh Kumar Jain

Present: Ms. Aashna Gill, Advocate, for
Mr. Aman Pal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashish Kapoor, Advocate, for respondent no.1.

Mr. Ashish Pannu, Advocate, for respondent no.2.

Rakesh Kumar Jain, J.

The Indian Oil Corporation Limited (hereinafter referred to as the "Corporation") issued an advertisement in "Dainik Bhaskar" newspaper on 29.03.2012 to appoint retail outlet dealers throughout the State of Haryana at various places including village Rohana, District Sonapat in General category. The petitioner and respondent no.2 were also the applicants. They were called for interview on 12.07.2012 and its result was declared on 05.06.2013, in which respondent no.2 was ranked at no.1 and the petitioner was ranked at no.2 as they had scored 92.2 marks and 91.5 marks respectively. The petitioner has challenged the result dated 05.06.2013 on the ground that respondent no.2, as per the spot inspection, has not offered the plot measuring 35 meters x 35 meters and, therefore, was not eligible.

After notice, the respondents have filed reply, in which the Corporation has alleged that on the complaint made by the petitioner, investigation was conducted by the panel of three officers of the Corporation to

find out as to whether the plot offered by respondent no.2 is having the front area of 35 meters and a block of 35 meters x 35 meters can be taken out from the offered plot. The Committee visited the site on 05.12.2013 in order to physically inspect the site and has opined that the land offered by respondent no.2 falls in Khasra No.91//18/1 and 22/2 of village Rohana, District Sonapat and is having the front area of $13+10=23$ karams i.e 126.7' (38.5 meters) and as per the Sajra Plan submitted by respondent no.2 and the demarcation shown by the Patwari, a block of 35 meters x 35 meters can be taken out and, thus, respondent no.2 has been found eligible.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the available record, I am of the considered opinion that there is no merit in the present petition because the complaint made by the petitioner has been thoroughly looked into by the Corporation by appointing a three members committee, comprising of Neeraj Rana, Manager (RS), PDO, Virender Pal Dahiya, Assistant Manager (Engg.), PDO and Tungnath Prasad, AM (RS), Sonapat RSA, who had visited the site on 05.12.2013 and found that the front area of the plot offered by respondent no.2 is 38.5 meters, out of which a block of 35 meters x 35 meters, as prescribed in the advertisement, can be taken out.

Consequently, there is hardly any reason for this Court to interfere in the present petition and hence, the same is hereby dismissed being denuded of any merit, though without any order as to costs.

July 25, 2017
vinod*

(Rakesh Kumar Jain)
Judge

Whether speaking / reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No