

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.12127 of 2013

=====

Irfat Ara Wife of Shahbaz Alam Resident of Village- Sontha P.S.- Kochadhaman,
District- Kishanganj

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. through its Chairman, G-9, Ali Yavar Jung Marg, Bandra (East), Mumbai- 400051
2. The G.M., Marketing, Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. (M.D.) Indian Area Office, Begusarai, P.O.- Barauni Oil Refinery, Dist.- Begusarai
3. The Area Manager, Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. (M.D.) Indian Area Office, Begusarai, P.O. Barauni Oil Refinery, Dist.- Begusarai
4. The Sales Officer, LPG-5, Purnea LPG Sales Area, Begusarai Area Office, Begusarai

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : None

For the Respondent/s : Mr. K.D. Chatterji, Sr. Adv

Mr. Amlesh Kumar Verma, Adv

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 08-08-2018

The present writ petition has been filed for the following reliefs—

- (i) For issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari or any other appropriate writ for quashing the letter dated 21.05.2013 vide Ref. No. BOA/98R (Annexure-6) by which the respondent no. 3 has rejected the application of the petitioner for Rajiv Gandhi Gramin LPG Vitrak (RGGLV) location at “Sontha” under open category and thus also canceling the selection of the petitioner on 14.02.2013 when she was selected in selection process i.e. by way of toss between the eligible



candidates. The cancellation of petitioner’s candidature is wholly on no nest ground and illegal and extraneous consideration in colourable exercise of power.

(ii) For issuance of any other appropriate writ or directions which your Lordships may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.

2. None appears on behalf of the petitioner despite repeated calls.

3. Learned counsel for the respondent-Corporation appears and opposes the writ petition. He refers to para 8 of the counter affidavit to submit that the petitioner’s candidature has rightly been rejected as the land offered by her did not stand in her name or any member of her “family unit” and the conditions in this regard as contained in the brochure have not been fulfilled and as such the petitioner was not found eligible for the said dealership.

4. Having regard to the stand of the respondent-Corporation which has not been controverted by the petitioner as no counter affidavit has been filed, this Court finds the writ petition to be devoid of merit. The same accordingly stands dismissed.

(Vikash Jain, J)

Chandran/BT

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	14.08.2018
Transmission Date	NA

