

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.13663 of 2013

=====

Rita Kumari wife of Sri Bishanu Kumar, resident of Village- Bhusari, P.O. Chhatauna, Dist.- Samastipur

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. Indian Oil Corporation Limited through its Managing Director, Indane Area Officer, Begusarai
2. The Area Manager, Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. Indian Area Office, Begusarai

.... 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: 06-11-2018

The present writ petition has been filed against the order dated 26.04.2013 passed by Area Manager, Indian Oil Corporation whereby and whereunder the application filed for Award of Rajiv Gandhi Gramin Vitrak (RGGLV) at the location Madhopur within the district Samastipur was rejected; and for a direction to the respondents to issue letter of intent in favour of the petitioner.

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.

3. A perusal of paragraph-11 of the writ petition discloses that the petitioner offered two pieces of land, the first held jointly by her husband with his brother Brajesh Kumar, and the second



owned by her husband.

4. Mr. Anil Kumar Sinha, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent-Indian Oil Company submits that the candidature of the petitioner has rightly been rejected. Reference is invited to the counter affidavit in which it is submitted that in terms of the Brochure, Sri Brajesh Kumar did not qualify as a member of the family unit of the petitioner and as such the relevant land was not considered. The land in the name of the husband of the petitioner fell short of the required dimension of 20M X 24M and hence the petitioner was treated as having insufficient land in the advertised location. It is submitted that the candidature therefore has rightly been rejected.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the respondents and on consideration of the materials on record, this Court finds the writ petition to be devoid of merit. The stand of the respondents with regard to insufficient land of the petitioner has not been disputed and no rejoinder to the counter affidavit has been filed.

6. The writ petition accordingly stands dismissed.

(Vikash Jain, J)

Md. Ibrarul/BT

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	08.11.2018
Transmission Date	N.A.

