

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

**CWP No.29115 of 2019 (O&M)
Date of Decision:22.10.2019**

Anjana Gupta

.....Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA

Present:- Ms. Chhavi Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA J.(Oral)

Petitioner is aggrieved of the action of the respondent-Indian Oil Corporation Limited, in having rejected her application for allotment of a petrol pump/retail outlet.

Counsel for the petitioner has been heard at length.

As per pleadings on record, petitioner had applied for allotment of a petrol pump/retail outlet, location site Bilaspur, Block Bilaspur, Tehsil Bilaspur, District Yamuna Nagar.

The application had been made under Group-2 Category i.e. having offered a piece of land on the strength of a long lease for a period in excess of 19 years 11 months.

The application of the petitioner stands rejected vide impugned order dated 27.08.2019 at Annexure P-9. Perusal of the impugned order would reveal the basis of rejection of the application of the petitioner i.e.the same piece of land has been offered by more than one applicant for the particular retail outlet location.

During the course of arguments it stands conceded that apart

from the present petitioner one Sh. Ravinder Chauhan had also submitted an application for dealership at the same very site and under the same very category i.e. Group-2 Category and by placing reliance upon a lease-deed pertaining to the same very parcel of land for which the petitioner had also submitted her application.

It has gone uncontroverted that the advertisement/brochure issued by the respondent-Corporation carried a specific condition on the subject and which was coined in the following terms:-

“The same piece of land cannot be offered by more than one applicant for a particular RO location against an advertisement. In case more than one application is received, offering the same piece of land, all such applications shall be rejected and allotment if made, would be liable for cancellation.”

Needless to observe that the application submitted by the petitioner had to be dealt with in terms of the conditions contained in the advertisement/brochure.

The conceded position is that both petitioner as also one Ravinder Chauhan had applied for the retail outlet dealership at the same site and by relying upon separate lease-deed pertaining to the same very parcel of land. By operation of the relevant condition as reproduced hereinabove, application of both the applicants were liable to be rejected.

This is precisely what has been done in terms of issuance of the impugned order dated 27.08.2019 at Annexure P-9.

There is no merit in the instant petition.

Petition dismissed.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

October 22, 2019

shweta

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No