

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.13399 of 2010

=====

Anoj Kumar S/O Surendra Kumar Sharma R/O Vill Manwan, P.O. Punther, P.S.
Hisua, Distt-Nawada (Bihar)

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The Union of India through the Secretary Ministry of Natural Gas Oil and Petroleum, New Delhi
2. Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited (A Government of India Undertaking) through its Chairman-Cum-Managing Director Bharat Bhawan Kasim Shah and Belord Estate Bombay-400001
3. The Regional Manager, Eastern Regional Office Bharat Bhawan, Plot No.31, K.I.T., Scheme No.118, Prince Gulam Mohammad Shah Road, Gold Green Kolkata-700095
4. Distributor Selection Committee L.P.G. Bharat Petroleum Bottling Plant Industrial Estate Rajpura Fatuha, Patna-803201
5. Regional Co-Ordinator , L.P.G. East Eastern Regional Office Kolkatta Bharat Bhawan Pol No.31, L.I.T. Scheme No.118, Prince Gulam Mohammad Shah Road Gold Green Kolkata-70096
6. Divisional Manager Bharat Corporation Limited III Floor Ashiana Chamber Exhibition Road, Patna-1
7. Shri Kaushalendra Kumar S/O Krishna Prasad Behind Nalanda College, Mohalla Garhpar P.S. Biharsharif, Distt-Nalanda
8. Ashok Kumar Proprietor Jay Mata Di Gas Agency, Biharsharif, Distt-Bordi Market Bharaw Par, P.S. Biharsharif, Distt-Nalanda

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	None
For the B.P.C.L	:	Mr. Mr. Siddhartha Prasad Mr. Om Prakash Kumar, Advocates.
For the Resp. No. 7	:	Mrs. Nevedita Nirvikar Mr. Manoj Kumar, Advocates.
For the UOI	:	Mrs. Kanak Verma, CGC

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 20-07-2018

The present writ petition has been filed for quashing
of the selection for award of L.P.G. Distributorship of Nawada, District
Nawada open category advertised on 17.10.2007 conducted by the
respondent no. 4 on 16.12.2009 at L.P.G. Territory and Bottling Plant
Fatuha Industrial Plant, Fatuha.



2. None appears on behalf of the petitioner despite repeated calls. It appears that on the earlier occasion also, the matter had to be taken up on 05.07.2018 in absence of the petitioner. After hearing the respondents, the order was dictated in open Court but soon thereafter the petitioner appeared and sought pass over which was granted. The matter cannot therefore be adjourned yet again if the petitioner has failed to appear.

3. Learned counsel for the respondent-BPCL states with reference to paragraph-18 of the supplementary counter affidavit filed on 07.05.2018 that the dealership in question has been awarded to the respondent no. 7 and the same has already been commissioned on 27.07.2010. The distributorship agreement was valid upto 26.07.2015 which has further been renewed for a period of five years upto 26.07.2010. The petitioner has not filed any rejoinder and hence the facts stated have not been controverted.

4. In the above view of the matter, this Court is not inclined to interfere in the matter. The writ petition stands dismissed.

(Vikash Jain, J)

Md. Ibrarul/BT

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	23.07.2018
Transmission Date	N.A.

