

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.12592 of 2013

Md. Rejauddin S/O Late Md. Mohiuddin R/O Village - Sangram, P.O. Tulapatganj Bazar, P.S. Jhanjarpur, District - Madhubani

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. Indian Oil Corporation Through Director (Marketing) Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. Registered Office & Marketing Division, Head Office At Indian Oil Bhawan, G - 9 Ali Yavar Jung Marg Bandra (East) Mumbai
2. General Manager, Indian Oil Corporation, Bihar State Office Indian Oil Corporation, Loknayaak Jaiprakash Bhawan, 5th Floor, Dak Banglow Chowk Patna
3. Deputy General Manager (RS), Bihar State Office Indian Oil Corporation, Loknayaak Jaiprakash Bhawan 5th Floor, Dak Banglow Chowk Patna
4. Senior Retail Sales Manager Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. Muzaffarpur Division Office Muzaffarpur
5. Union Of India Through Ministry Of Oil And Natural Gas New Delhi
6. Sri Amit Kumar Jha Son Of Pradeep Kumar Jha Resident Of Village & Post Araria Via Tulapatganj, P.S. Jhanjarpur, District - Madhubani

... .. Respondents

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	None
For the Respondents	:	Mr. Anil Kumar Sinha, Mr. Yash Mathur, Advocates

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 03-12-2018

The present writ petition has been filed for quashing the letter dated 22.04.2013 (Annexure-12) and for deciding the complaint of the petitioner with regard to unsuitability of the private respondent no. 6.

2. As none appeared on behalf of the petitioner the matter was passed over for a few cases. However, on repeat call the petitioner was again not represented. On the last occasion, on 26.11.2018, the petitioner was not represented when the matter was called. Hence, this Court is not inclined to adjourn the matter any further.



3. Learned counsel for the respondent-Corporation appears and invites reference to paragraph 5 of the counter affidavit stating that retail outlet of the respondent no. 6 had been commissioned on 30.04.2015 itself. It is submitted that upon investigation, it was concluded in terms of the inspection report (Annexure-R/1) that the land offered by the petitioner was not found to be suitable and as such the allegation made by the private respondent no. 6 in this regard was found to be established. It has further been concluded that the petitioner's allegation against the land offered by the respondent no. 6 was not found to be established. A copy of the counter affidavit has been served upon the petitioner on 05.09.2018 but the stand of the respondent-Corporation has not been disputed as no rejoinder thereto had been filed by the petitioner.

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

BT/Chandran

(Vikash Jain, J)

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	07.12.2018
Transmission Date	N.A.

