

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8738 of 2019

=====

Sangam Kumari W/o Sri Pankaj Kumar Vill.- Hathisar, P.s.- Purnahiya, Distt.- Sheohar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. THE UNION OF INDIA through the Secretary Petroleum and Natural Gas, Govt. of India, New Delhi
2. Indian Oil Corporation through its Chairman
3. Managing Director BPCL Bharat Bhawan, 31/118, Prince Gulam Road, Kolkata
4. Regional Manager BPCL, Muzaffarpur
5. Territorial Manager BPCL, Muzaffarpur
6. District Magistrate Sheohar
7. District Nodal Officer Muzaffarpur
8. Pratima Devi W/o Late Nawal Kishore Rai Vill.- Khaira Pahari (Dostiaya), P.s.- Purnahiya, Distt.- Sheohar
9. Prem Shankar Yadav S/o..... Vill.- Khaira, Pahari (Dostiaya), P.s.- Purnahiya, Distt.- Sheohar

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anuj Kumar
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Arvind Ujjwal (Sc4)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR

ORAL ORDER

2 08-01-2020 Heard Mr. Yogesh Chandra Verma, learned senior Advocate for the petitioner; Mr. Sanad Kumar Mishra, learned counsel for the IOC; and Mr. Upendra Pratap Singh, learned counsel for the State.

The petitioner is aggrieved by the selection of private-respondent no. 8 as one of the retailer of the LPG outlet.



The sole ground on which the grant of license to private-respondent no. 8 has been challenged is that along with her application form, she did not append the caste certificate which could have brought her into the arena of eligibility as mandated in the advertisement against which such application was made.

From the perusal of the writ petition, it appears that the application form of private-respondent no. 8 has not been annexed; rather the application form of the petitioner has been annexed with the petition.

From the perusal of the application form, it further appears that the applicants were only required to express their willingness of supplying / submitting copies of eligibility certificates for the categories as applicable in case of their selection.

The only assertion which has been made in the writ petition is that such certificate was not appended along with the application form by private-respondent no. 8.



There is no specific / categorical averment that private-responderent no. 8 does not have the eligibility to apply for the retail dealership.

Considering this aspect of the matter, the writ petition does not appear to be maintainable. Hence, it is dismissed.

(Ashutosh Kumar, J)

skm/-

U			
---	--	--	--

