

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Writ Petition (C) No. 1778 of 2020

Rakesh Agrawal S/o Late Shri Rajaram Agrawal, Aged About 47 Years R/o A-206, Kuber Apartment, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.

---Petitioner(s)

Versus

1. Indian Oil Corporation Limited Raipur Division Office, Through Chief Divisional, Retail Sales Manager, Raipur Divisional Office, Indian Oil Bhawan, Rajiv Gandhi Marg, (VIP Road) Post Ravigram, Telibanda, Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. The Chief Divisional Retail Sales Manager, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Divisional Office Raipur, Indian Oil Bhawan, Rajiv Gandhi Marg (VIP Road), Post Ravigram, Telibanda, Raipur Chhattisgarh.
3. Shivram Rajaram Agrawal S/o Shri Rajaram Agrawal, Aged About 53 Years Proprietor M/s. Gaurav Filling Station, R/o C-2, Gawri Apartment, Behind Amit Sales, Gali No. 1, Fafadih, Raipur Chhattisgarh. 492001. Permanent Address 403/11 B, Alkapuri Society, G.I.D.C. Ankleshwar, District Bharuch, Gujarat- 393002.

---Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri Manoj Paranjpe with Shri Amit Soni, Advocates.
For Respondent No. 1&2	:	Shri Anand Shukla, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

19.08.2020

1. The grievance of the petitioner in the present writ petition or the relief which the petitioner seeks in the present writ petition is that the objection that the petitioner has raised before the respondent No.1 in respect of the allotment of the dealership to the respondent No.3 is concerned, should be considered and decided after giving the petitioner an opportunity of hearing.
2. According to the petitioner, there are certain serious disputes which the respondent No.1 may not be aware of which would disentitle the respondent No.3 so far as granting of the dealership.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents No.1&2 submits that the objection and the representation of the petitioner dated 07.09.2019 and 16.10.2019 has been duly considered by the respondents and a notice of termination has already been issued to the respondent No.3 and the respondent No.3 also has submitted his response. This, according to the respondents No.1&2 is sufficient to show that the objections raised by the petitioner has been seriously acted upon by the respondent No.1.
4. Given the said submission by the counsel on either side, this court does not intend to keep this petition pending. Rather, the writ petition itself stands disposed of at this juncture expecting that the respondents while deciding the applications would take note of and shall objectively consider the objections which the petitioner has raised.
5. With the aforesaid direction, the writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge