

**HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.RAJASHEKER REDDY**

**WRIT PETITION No.18482 OF 2018**

**O R D E R :**

The case of the petitioner is that she submitted application to the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent for LPG dealership on 04.10.2017 along with the particulars of leased land as per the specifications in the notification and necessary fee. Thereafter, the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent has taken draw of lots and petitioner's application has come in the draw and later petitioner has received a letter dated 04.01.2018 from the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent to deposit an amount of Rs.20,000/- and also to submit list of documents specified in the said letter within seven working days. As per the said letter, petitioner submitted all the documents. In pursuance of the same, at the request of the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent, the petitioner also submitted some more documents on 07.02.2018. Subsequently, on 14.03.2018 the respondent Corporation addressed a letter dated 14.03.2018 informing the petitioner that the land offered by the petitioner in the application is not meeting the eligibility criteria advertised for location and also asked the petitioner to provide alternative land within the village either owned by the petitioner/member of the family unit/parents and other persons mentioned therein and asked to give notarized affidavit to the said effect. In pursuance of the same, petitioner submitted notarized affidavit on 24.03.2018 duly stating that she owns leased land bearing

Door No.2-48 at Gollapalle Village which belongs to her husband's cousin. But, without considering the same, on 16.05.2018, her candidature was rejected on the ground that the land for showroom offered by the petitioner in the application is not within the village limits of Gollapalle Village and the alternate land offered by the petitioner also does not belong to the petitioner or any of her accepted relations specified in the Unified Guidelines framed for selection of LPG Distributors. Aggrieved by the same present writ petition is filed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in pursuance of the letter dated 14.03.2018, petitioner offered notarized affidavit from among her family members; and that the respondents could not have rejected the candidature of the petitioner by accepting the lease deed of the third parties.

On the other hand Sri Mayur Reddy, learned Standing Counsel for respondents 2 and 3 submits that the person who has given notarized affidavit does not fall within the definition of family as defined under Unified Guidelines framed for Selection of LPG Distributors. He also submits that the petitioner has alternate remedy under clause 27 of the said guidelines by way of Grievance/Complaint Redressal system.

In this case admittedly petitioner has not availed the remedy under clause-27 of the Unified Guidelines for

Selection of LPG Distributors. Petitioner can raise all her objections before the Grievance Redressal Forum i.e. Regional Manager of the respondent Corporation where the site is located, as stated by the learned Standing Counsel for respondent Corporation, within one week from today and on such complaint the competent authority shall consider the said objections and pass orders. Till orders are passed no Letter of Intent (LOI) shall be granted by the respondents to the third parties in respect of subject dealership. However, it is always open for the petitioner to question the order passed by the Grievance Redressal Officer.

Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of. No order as to costs.

As a sequel thereto, Miscellaneous Petitions, if any, pending in this Writ Petition shall stand closed.

---

**A.RAJASHEKER REDDY, J**

06.06.2018

Note: Issue CC by 07.06.2018.

t k.