

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPC No. 2559 of 2019**

Rajendra Kumar Agrahari S/o Banwari Lal Agrahari Aged About 42 Years
 R/o Ward No. 2, Matiyari, Janji Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh., District : Bilaspur,
 Chhattisgarh **--- Petitioner**

Versus

1. Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited through its Chairman Cum Managing Director, 17, Jamshedji Tata Road, Petroleum House, Mumbai Maharashtra.
2. Regional Officer Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited Bilaspur Retail Regional Office 1st Floor, Bajpais Pavilion Opp. Gumber Petrol Pump, Vyapar Vihar Road, Bilaspur Chhattisgarh. **--- Respondents**

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Goutam Khetrapal, Advocate
For Respondents/State	:	Mr. Ali Asgar, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri**Order on Board****28-08-2019**

1. This writ petition has been moved with the following main reliefs :

“10.1 That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to issue an appropriate writ, thereby directing the respondent authorities to forthwith refund the amount deposited by the petitioner towards allotment of retail outlet dealership, with interest @ 12% per annum.

10.2 That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent authorities to issue fresh advertisement for selection of retail outlet dealership for location Matiyari, Pandhi-Beltara Road, in accordance with law.”

2. Reply has been filed by the respondents wherein it has been stated that the application fee of Rs.8000/- and Initial Security Deposit (ISD) of Rs.40,000/- have been refunded to the petitioner, therefore, nothing survives for adjudication in this writ petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that since the amount has been refunded by the respondents, relief clause 10.1 has already been complied with.
4. So far as it relates to relief 10.2, it is within the domain of the respondents as to whether fresh advertisement for selection of retail outlet dealership for location Matiyari, Pandhi-Beltara be issued or not ? This Court in exercise of powers under Article 226 of the Constitution cannot direct for re-advertisement to select a dealer for a particular location.
5. Since the fact is not in dispute that the amount has been received, nothing remains for adjudication in this writ petition. Accordingly, this writ petition is dismissed.

Sd/-

(Goutam Bhaduri)
Judge

Rao