

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2678 of 2019

=====

Aditya Raj S/o Ramagati Paswan, Vill.-Sikari, P.O.-Kolhua, P.s.-Adhaura,
Distt.-Kaimur at Bhabhua.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Chief Regional Manager, Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited,
Patna
2. The District Magistrate-cum-Collector Kaimur at Bhabhua.
3. The Area Manager Kaimur, Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited,
Kaimur at Bhabhua.
4. Circle Officer Adhaura, P.S.-Adhaura, Distt.-Kaimur at Bhabhua.
5. Gulab Chand Ram S/o Ramdani Ram, Vill.-Kalhuan, P.S.-Adhaura, Distt.-
Bhabhua, Kaimur

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Sumeet Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Alok Ranjan, AC to AAG-5
For the HPCL	:	Mr. Sanjay Kumar Mishra, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

2 17-06-2019 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel representing the Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited
as also the State.

This writ application has been filed for issuance of a
direction to the concerned authorities of the Hindustan Petroleum
Corporation Limited (hereinafter referred to as ‘the Corporation’) to
cancel the LPG Distributorship granted to the private respondent no.
‘5’ for the location Kaluha, Block Adhaura, P.S.- Adhaura, District-
Kaimur.

It is the contention of the petitioner that respondent no. ‘5’
has been granted the LPG Distributorship on the basis of the



documents which were back dated and contrary to the Unified Guidelines for selection of LPG Distributorship issued in June, 2017.

Learned counsel for the Corporation has drawn the attention of this Court towards the communication dated June 21, 2018 as contained in Annexure '5' to the writ application by which the petitioner was informed upon consideration of his representation that during the filed verification the document produced by the private respondent was not found in accordance with the parameters fixed in Selection Guidelines but then following the Clause 18 b of the Guidelines one opportunity was granted to respondent no. '5' to make available an alternative land, thereafter, respondent no. '5' made available the documents for LPG Godown as an alternative place and that was found to be in accordance with the Guidelines, therefore, his application was accepted.

Learned counsel submits that the communication as contained in Annexure '5' is not under challenge and after this communication no further representation has been made to any senior officer of the Corporation in this regard. The petitioner has moved this Court after about eight months from the date of said communication.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and on perusal of the records, this Court finds that in paragraph 16 of the writ application the petitioner has made a statement that he had filed



a representation to the Chief Regional Manager on 17.12.2018, however, the fact is that the representation of the petitioner filed on 25.01.2018 was duly considered by the Chief Regional Manager and the petitioner was well informed of the consideration given to his representation. The allegation of the petitioner that the private respondent had produced anti-dated document and the lease deed was in respect of the land which were not appropriate for the godown have been duly addressed in Annexure '5' by informing the petitioner that in fact subsequently the private respondent was given an opportunity to make available the alternative piece of land for the godown which he had duly made available.

The contention of the learned counsel for the Corporation that the communication as contained in Annexure '5' is not under challenge in the writ application is correct.

This being the position, this Court finds no reason to issue any direction as prayed in the writ application.

This writ application has no merit. It is dismissed accordingly.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

avin/-ved

U			
---	--	--	--

