

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 10.01.2018

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAVICHANDRABAABU

Writ Petition No.487 of 2018
and
WMP.Nos.588 & 589 of 2018

K.Rajaguru
S/o.Kaliyamoorthy

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Chief Area Manager
Indian Oil Corporation Ltd.,
Indane Trichy Area Office
B-35, Sasthri Road,
Thillai Nagar, Trichy.

2. Senthilvelan Ramalingam
S/o.Ramalingam Rajamanickam

.. Respondents

Writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records of the 1st respondent pertains to the impugned appointment of LPG Distributorship - Tamil Nadu and quash the same insofar as S.No.237, Srimushnam location, consequently, direct the 1st respondent to conduct fresh selection so far as Srimushnam location, Cuddalore District under the OBC category.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.R.Thiruneelakandan
For Respondents : Mr.Abdul Saleem, for R1

ORDER

This writ petition is filed challenging the appointment of the second respondent to LPG Distributorship in S.No. S.No.237, Srimushnam location with consequential prayer for a direction to the first respondent to conduct fresh selection insofar as the said location is concerned under the OBC category.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned counsel for the first respondent.

3. The only grievance of the petitioner in this writ petition is that while conducting the drawal of lot by online method, the first respondent failed to note that one Karpagavalli has filed two applications and those two applications were formed as part of the drawal of lot, especially, when Rule 12 of the IOC guidelines contemplates that only one application from one applicant for one location should be submitted. In other words, it is the contention of the petitioner that because of entertaining two applications from the said Karpagavalli and allowing those two applications to form part of the drawal of lot had defeated the

chance of the petitioner to get selected.

4. Upon considering the facts and circumstances and hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned counsel for the first respondent, it is evident that admittedly, the said Karpagavalli was not selected. On the other hand, the second respondent, who is totally a different person, was selected to the said location, who in turn has submitted one application only. Therefore, by such submission of two applications by the said Karpagavalli, when she was not benefited by any selection, I do not think that the petitioner can have any cause of action, against the selection of the second respondent, based on the only contention raised by him as stated supra. Therefore, this Court is of the view that this petitioner has not made out a case for entertaining this writ petition. Accordingly, this writ petition fails and the same is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

WEB COPY

10.01.2018

Speaking/Non Speaking
Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes/No
mk

K.RAVICHANDRABAABU,J.

mk

To

The Chief Area Manager
Indian Oil Corporation Ltd.,
Indane Trichy Area Office
B-35, Sasthri Road,
Thillai Nagar, Trichy.



W.P.No.487 of 2018

WEB COPY

10.01.2018