

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 2880 OF 2018

Harshad s/o Vishnudas Bhorde

Petitioner

Versus

The Union of India
& others

Respondents

Mr. R.P. Phatke, advocate for petitioner.

Mr. S.B. Deshpande, Standing Counsel for respondent no. 1.

Mr. A.P. Bhandari, advocate for respondents 1 and 2.

CORAM : R.M.BORDE &

K.K. SONAWANE, JJ.

DATE : 19th MARCH, 2018

PER COURT:

1. Application tendered by petitioner for allotment of LPG distributorship in the rural area has been turned down for the reason that the registered lease deed in respect of the land and godown has been registered in the office of the Sub-Registrar, Newasa, on 04.10.2017, which date falls after the last date of submission of application i.e. 03.10.2017.

2. Petitioner contends that infact he tendered the document for registration on earlier date. However, due to technical difficulties at the office of the Sub-Registrar, the document was not registered and the same came to be registered on the next date. Apart from the fact that the submission of the application for registration itself is beyond the prescribed date and time of submission of application i.e. 03.10.2017, it is pointed out that petitioner has furnished false information in the application tendered by him on

01.10.2017 to the petroleum company. The petitioner has indicated in the application that the date of registration of the lease deed for LPG godwn and showroom is 28.09.2017. However, on the aforesaid date, the documents were not at all registered. It is apparent on perusal of the record that only a notarised document has been registered on the aforesaid date, which information ought to have been furnished by the petitioner. Instead thereof, he tendered information in the application that on the aforesaid date, the lease deed has been registered.

3. It is further informed by learned counsel for respondents that today fresh draw has been drawn for appointment of distributor and the result of the draw has also been declared. In these circumstances and for the reasons recorded above, no interference is called for in exercise of extra ordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. It would be open for the petitioner to tender application to the petroleum company for reconsidering its decision of forfeiture of the security deposit. Petition is devoid of substance hence stands rejected.

4. Pending civil application, if any, does not survive and stands disposed of.

K. K. SONAWANE
JUDGE

R.M.BORDE
JUDGE