

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WRIT PETITION (C) NO. 752 OF 2020**

- Sahdev Gond, S/o Shri Panchram Gond, aged about 40 years, R/o Village Semra, Post Office Gidhouri, Police Station Gidhouri, Tahsil Kasdol, District Balodabazar-Bhatapara (CG)

... Petitioner**versus**

1. Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Registered Office, Indian Oil Bhawan, G-9, Yavar Jang Marg Bandra (East) Mumbai 400051 (Maharashtra)
2. Divisional Officer, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, V.I.P. Road, Post Ravi Gram, Telibandha, Raipur, District Raipur (CG)

... Respondents

For Petitioner

:

Mr. Nasimuddin Ansari, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****25/02/2020**

1. Grievance of the petitioner in the present writ petition is the rejection of the application filed by the petitioner for retail outlet dealership of Indian Oil Council.
2. The present is a second round of litigation. The earlier round of litigation was Writ Petition (C) No. 4624/2019 which came up for hearing before this Court on 17.12.2019 and this Court had directed the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner and intimate him suitably in respect of his application. The respondents subsequently vide Annexure P-2, dated 10.1.2020, has intimated the petitioner that his application is not sustainable for the reason that the property which he has shown for the location of awarding dealership is situated on the State Highway and so far as the grant of rural retail outlet the property on the State Highway, National Highway or within the municipal limits of town is concerned the same would not be acceptable in terms of the guidelines of the company, dated 24.11.2018.
3. Given the fact that there is a guideline of the respondent-corporation dated 24.11.2028 which bars any rural retail outlet dealership being opened on the State Highway, National Highway or within the municipal limits of town, this Court does not find any illegality on the part of the respondents in rejecting the candidature of the petitioner since the property of the petitioner is on the State Highway, nor

does this court find any strong case to be made out by the petitioner for issuance of a writ to the respondents for reconsidering their decision so far as the case of the petitioner is concerned. Another reason which cannot be lost sight of is the fact that the guideline dated 24.11.2018 is not under challenge in the present writ petition.

4. In view of above, the writ petition fails and the same deserves to be and is accordingly dismissed.

/sharad/

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE