

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

**CWP-23999-2013 (O & M)  
Date of decision: 21.07.2017**

Commodore Vijay Kumar Gautam NM (Retd.)

....Petitioner

V/s

Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. and anr.

...Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJAN GUPTA**

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashish Kapoor, Advocate, for the respondent-Corpn.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Rajan Gupta, J. (Oral)**

Mr. Kapoor, learned counsel representing respondents No.1 and 2 submits that there is a company own outlet in Sector 33. The Corporation periodically selects a service provider to run the same. On 4<sup>th</sup> January, 2014, an advertisement was issued and a service provider was selected in July, 2014. Petitioner was not an applicant thereto. Now term of the service provider will also expire tomorrow. Fresh advertisement has already been issued. According to him, no cause of action survives in this petition.

Case has been called out twice since morning. Petitioner remains unrepresented.

This court finds substance in the plea of the counsel for the Corporation that present petition has been rendered infructuous, ordered accordingly. Dismissed as infructuous.

Needless to say that the petitioner is always at a liberty to

issued by the Corporation from time to time for selection as service provider.

July 21, 2017  
sukhpreet

(RAJAN GUPTA)  
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No