

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

112

**CWP No. 4004 of 2018
Date of Decision: 20.4.2018**

Satwinder Kaur**.....Petitioner****v.****Union of India and others****.....Respondents****CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR JAIN**

Present : Mr. L.M. Gulati, Advocate, for the petitioner

RAKESH KUMAR JAIN, J.

This petition is directed against the order dated 16.9.2017 passed by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited (for short 'the Corporation') by which prayer made by the petitioner for considering her candidature for the allotment of LPG Distributorship for the location at Mamdot, District Ferozepur was declined on the ground that she was third panelist whereas the first and second panelist have been cancelled.

Shorn of unnecessary details, the prayer of the petitioner has been declined by respondent No.4 on the ground that validity of the panel is maintained for one year from the date of commissioning of distributorship. In this regard, reference could be had to Clause 17 of the Brochure (Selection of LPG Distributors, June 2006) which read as under :-

“17. Validity of Merit Panel

The merit panel will be valid for a period of one year from the date of commissioning of the distributorship. If within this period, the distributorship is withdrawn for any reason whatsoever of the distributorship is terminated on account of wrong statement made in the

application or any other reason like proven ineligibility of the distributor or proven malpractice, oil company will have the option of awarding distributorship to the next candidate in the merit panel after necessary Field verification.”

After necessary field verification, it is an admitted fact that the distributorship was allotted to respondent No.5-Naresh Kumar, who commissioned it on 26.4.2014 and was terminated on 3.8.2017. Therefore, the prayer of the petitioner is not within one year from the date of commissioning. Therefore, the petitioner cannot claim the distributorship on the ground that after the exit of respondent No.5 on 3.8.2017, the distributorship can be given to her.

In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, there is hardly any scope for interference in this petition.

Dismissed. No costs.

(RAKESH KUMAR JAIN)
JUDGE

20.4.2018

Ashwani

Speaking/Reasoned
Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No