

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4780 of 2019

=====

Poonam Rao W/o- Sri Rajnish Rao R/o- Village- Mushari, (Bijbaniya), P.S.-
Sirisiya, District- West Champaran, Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Managing Director, Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd. and Ors
registered office- Bharat Bhawan, 4 and 6, Currimbhoy Road, Ballard
Estate, Post Box No.- 688, Mumbai- 400001.
2. The Regional Manager, Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited, Patna.
3. The Territory Manager, (LPG), Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited,
Muzaffarpur.
4. The Field Verification Committee through its Member, Bharat Petroleum
Corporation Ltd., LPG Territory, Muzaffarpur.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Om Prakash
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Siddhartha Prasad

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

2 24-07-2019 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned

counsel representing the Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited

(in short 'BPCL').

Petitioner in this case is aggrieved by the
communication as contained in letter dated 15.11.2018 issued
under the signature of the Field Verification Committee
Member, Lohiaria Location, Muzaffarpur by which the
petitioner has been communicated that the validity of the lease
deed submitted by the petitioner is short by 17 days and,
therefore, the land offered by him with khata no.129, khasra
no.374 is not suitable for go-down. The same has been stated



with respect to the land offered for showroom and godown.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that because of inadvertent and typographical error in the lease deed instead of month July 2032, the month June 2032 was typed. It is submitted that the same is a totally unintentional mistake and for that reason alone, the candidature of the petitioner need not be cancelled.

Learned counsel for the respondent Corporation submits that when the lease deed of the petitioner was found containing a period short by 17 days for which the land should have been made available by the petitioner on the date of application the petitioner was given an opportunity to provide an alternate land for the said location, but the petitioner has instead of making available the alternate land chosen to file the present writ application.

Having gone through the materials available on the record and the submissions of the parties, this Court is of the considered opinion that so far as the ground that the lease deed contain a period short by 17 days from 15 years for which the lease deed should have been valid, needs no interference by this Court. The petitioner claims to have made a representation before the authorities concerned. If the authorities of the



Corporation are willing to accept any alternate land suitable for the purpose which will be provided by the petitioner, it is for the petitioner to persuade them for the same.

This writ application is thus disposed off in terms stated hereinabove.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

arvind/-

U			
---	--	--	--

