

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3137 of 2020

=====

Sunil Kumar, Son of Sri Ramnandan Prasad Singh, Resident of 7HF Block- 2,
Flat No. 42, Bahadurpur Housing Colony, Bhutnath Road, P.S. Agamkuan,
District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The General Manager, Life Insurance Corporation of India Jeevan Bima Marg, Nariman Point, Mumbai, Maharastra- 400021
2. The Senior Divisional Manager, Patna Division Office-2, Life Insurance Corporation of India, Jeevan Ganga Building Fraser Road, District- Patna.
3. The Divisional Manager, Patna Division Office-2, Life Insurance Corporation of India, Jeevan Ganga Building Fraser Road, District- Patna.
4. The Manager (E and OS), Life Insurance, Corporation of India.
5. The Branch Manager, Patna Division Office-2, Life Insurance Corporation of India, Jeevan Ganga Building Fraser Road, District- Patna.
6. Rakesh Kumar, Son of not known to the Petitioner, Resident of Didarganj, P.S. Didarganj, District- Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Manoj Kumar Pandey, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Abhimanyu Vatsa, Adv.
Mr. Raj Dular Sah, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 27-02-2020

The petitioner seeks a direction to the
respondent/Life Insurance Corporation of India (LIC) to



choose/accept the house offered by him to be selected and used as a godown for keeping records. The house was offered by the petitioner on the advertisement issued by the LIC. There were other applicants also with their respective offers.

2. It appears from the records of the case that the house of private respondent No. 6 has been selected for using the same as godown.

3. Mr. Manoj Kumar Pandey, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the requirement of selection according to the advertisement was that the house in question must be within 5 kms. of Zero Mile, By-Pass Road and Danapur, but the house offered by private respondent No. 6 does not fall in the aforesaid categories.

4. This is the reason for the petitioner to approach this Court with a prayer for cancellation of the selection of the house of private respondent No. 6 and instead, selecting the house offered by him to be taken as godown.

5. This Court wonders whether selection of a



godown would come within the purview of the subject matter of trade and commerce. Any income derived from letting out a premises is only a soft-earned income, which does not contribute to trade and commerce. Apart from this case not falling in the concerned roster, no writ would lie for selection of a particular house as a godown by a public sector enterprise. It cannot be said that there is any right of a person to have his house selected for any purpose by a public sector undertaking.

6. The writ petition is highly misconceived and is, therefore, dismissed.

(Ashutosh Kumar, J)

Praveen-II/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	29.02.2020
Transmission Date	N/A

