

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

WRIT PETITION NO.7597 OF 2018

Ashwini w/o Sudhir Pawar

..Petitioner

Versus

The Union of India, through
the Secretary, Ministry of
Petroleum & Gas,
Government of India,
Shashtri Bhavan,
New Delhi and ors.

..Respondents

Mr H.D. Deshmukh, Advocate for petitioner
Mr A.P. Bhandari, Advocate for respondent no.2

**CORAM : R.M. BORDE AND
A.M. DHAVAL, JJ.**

DATE : 16th July 2018

PER COURT

1. The petitioner is objecting to allotment of retail outlet for distribution of L.P.G. at village Dabhadi, Taluka Badnapur, District Jalna. The petitioner contends that the location offered by respondent no.3 for setting up the show room for distribution of L.P.G. is the same location, which has been offered by other six participants in the process. It is also contended that the document of lease executed between respondent no.3 and the original owner is not in accordance with the terms contained in the brochure published by the petroleum company.

2. Counsel Mr Bhandari appears for petroleum company and contends that in fact, the petitioner failed to substantiate his objection by tendering relevant documents within the time limit prescribed under the regulation. The petitioner was communicated on 19th February 2018 to submit the documents to substantiate his objection

within a period of fifteen days from the date of issuance of letter. However, the petitioner tendered the documents with the authorities on 18th March 2018, much beyond the period prescribed for tendering the documents. Apart from this, even on consideration of the merits of the objections raised by the petitioner, those appears to be unsubstantiated. Original owner of the property is having 1551 square feet area out of Survey No.176 at village Dabhadi, Taluka Badnapur, District Jalna. It appears that the original owner has constructed several shops and those six applicants, who participated in the tender process offered different constructed shops having different dimensions.

3. There does not appear to be any error in offering different shops at the same location by different participants. Even on consideration of merits of the petition, the contention raised by the Counsel for petitioner does not appear to be correct.

4. Writ Petition being devoid of merits is dismissed.

(A.M. DHAVAL, J.)

(R.M. BORDE, J.)

vvr