

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.13575 of 2013

=====

Anish Kumar son of Ramesh Kumar Singh, Resident of Mohalla Shekhpura
Brahamsthan, Raja Bajar, Patna, P.O. – B.V. College, Patna, P.S. Lalbahadur
Shashtrinagar, District Patna

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The Indian Oil Corporation Limited through its Chairman/Managing Director.
2. Managing Director, India Oil Co. Ltd. both, having its registered office at G-9 Ali Yavar Jung Marg, Bandra (East) Mumbai – 400051 (India) , P.S. Aliyavar Jung, District Bandra (East) State Maharashtra.
3. The General Manager, Area Office, Indian Oil Corporation Limited having its office at Lok Nayak Jai Prakash Bhawan, 5th Floor, Dak Bunglow Chowk, Patna 800001, P.S. Gandhi Maidan District Patna
4. The Chief Area Manager, Patna Area Office, First Floor, Shahi Bhawan, Exhibition Road, Patna – 80000 P.S. Gandhi Maidan, District Patna, Department -- Indian Oil Corporation Limited

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondents : Mr. Anil Kumar Jha, Sr. Advocate
Mr. Sanat Kumar Mishra, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 17-09-2018

The present writ petition has been filed for quashing the letter dated 15.05.2013 (Annexure-5) issued by the respondent-Indian Oil Corporation Limited by which the petitioner's application for award of LPG Distributorship at Buxar, District Buxar has been rejected.

2. None appears on behalf of the petitioner when the matter is called. The matter was earlier adjourned on account of non-appearance of the petitioner on 28.08.2018, 04.09.2018 and 10.09.2018 as well. This Court is not inclined to defer the matter any further.



3. At the very outset, learned senior counsel for the respondent-Corporation invites a reference to the advertisement issued on 18.05.2012 (Annexure-1), in column no. 6 of which the location for Buxar was shown as 'Urban/Rural'. Subsequently, however, on detecting the error, a corrigendum dated 27.05.2012 was issued in which "Type of Market" was corrected to read as "Urban" in place of "Urban/Rural" and the last date of submission of the application forms was extended till 29.06.2012 in place of 22.06.2012. The petitioner admittedly filed his application within the extended time aforesaid but did not comply with the requirement based on market type as "Urban". He therefore submits that the petitioner did not fulfill the conditions and the respondent-Corporation has rightly rejected the candidature of the petitioner. No infirmity can be found in the action of the respondents in rejecting the petitioner's candidature. The stand of the respondents in the counter affidavit has not been disputed and no rejoinder thereto has been filed by the petitioner.

4. The writ petition accordingly stands dismissed.

(Vikash Jain, J)

B.T/Chandran

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	20.09.2018
Transmission Date	N.A.

