

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

104 WRIT PETITION NO.1778 OF 2019

KUNAL KESHAV KOLI

..PETITIONER

VERSUS

**HINDUSTAN PETROLEUM CORPORATION LTD THROUGH GENERAL
MANAGER AND ANOTHER ..RESPONDENTS**

...

Mr. Sushant V. Dixit, Advocate for the Petitioner.
Mrs. Anjali Dube (Bajpai), Advocate for Respondent
Nos.1 and 2.

...

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA &
AVINASH G. GHAROTE, JJ.**

DATED : 02nd DECEMBER, 2019.

PER COURT:-

1. Mr. Dixit, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was initially considered from Group-I (priority group). Subsequently, his candidature is rejected. Initially, Gram Panchayat, Ichchhapur and Nimkhedi (Bk.) were part of the same group Gram Panchayat. Subsequently, they are bifurcated. The land of the petitioner offered is at Ichchhapur. As per the advertisement, the location was at Nimkhedi (Bk.). The learned counsel submits that the petitioner could have been considered from Group-II as his residence is in the concerned revenue sub division of the advertised location.

2. Mrs. Dube, learned counsel submits that the land offered by the petitioner was not as per the location advertised.

3. We have considered the submission canvassed by the learned counsel for the respective parties.

4. The undisputed fact emerging from the record is that the petitioner is resident of Ichchhapur and the land offered by the petitioner is situated at Ichchhapur. The location advertised was for village Nimkhedi (Bk.), Taluka Muktainagar, Dist. Jalgaon.

5. As admittedly the land offered by the petitioner was for different location than advertised, the application of the petitioner itself was not tenable.

6. As far as refund of the amount is concerned, the petitioner may approach the authority concerned.

7. In light of the above, no case for interference is made out. Writ Petition is disposed of. No costs.

(AVINASH G. GHAROTE)
JUDGE

(S. V. GANGAPURWALA)
JUDGE