



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 09.11.2021

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

W.P.No.27464 of 2014

and

M.P.No.1 of 2014

M.Gokul Krishnan

...Petitioner

Vs

1.The Chief Area Manager,
Indian Oil Corporation Ltd.,
Anna Salai,
Chennai - 600 018.

2.Mrs.Porkodi Mariyappan

...Respondents

PRAYER : Writ Petition filed Under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Declaration, declaring that the candidature of the selected 2nd respondent in the lot drawn on 05.9.2014 for allotment of LPG Gas Distributorship for Panaiyur Location in Kancheepuram District is illegal and direct the 1st respondent to re-draw the lot as per Condition 12 of the Brochure issued in RAJIV GANDHI GRAMIN LPG VITRAK (RGGLV).

For Petitioner : Mr.E.P.Senniyangiri

For Respondents : For R1 - Mr.Mohammed Fayaz Ali
For R2 - No appearance

O R D E R

The relief sought for in the present writ petition is to declare the candidature of the selected 2nd respondent in the lot drawn on 05.9.2014 for allotment of LPG Gas Distributorship for Panaiyur Location in Kancheepuram District is illegal and to direct the 1st respondent to re-draw the lot as per Condition 12 of the Brochure issued in RAJIV GANDHI GRAMIN LPG VITRAK (RGGLV).

2. The grievance of the writ petitioner is that the land offered by the second respondent for allotment of LPG Gas Distributorship is the violation of the terms and conditions of the advertisement made by the first respondent / Indian Oil Corporation Limited.



3. The learned counsel for the first respondent drew the attention of this Court with reference to the facts stated in Paragraph 3 of the counter affidavit, which reads as under:

"I submit that thereafter the 2nd respondent was selected in the draw of lots and Field Verification of the land provided by the 2nd respondent was conducted. I submit that in the field verification it was discovered that over the land provided by the 2nd respondent there is a residential building and therefore, the said land provided by the 2nd respondent was rejected. I further submit that the candidature of the 2nd respondent would be rejected all together if the 2nd respondent is unable to provide an alternative site owned by her to the 1st respondent in the advertised location."

4. In view of the fact that the first respondent rejected the land offered by the second respondent, the grievance as raised by the petitioner did not exist and thus, no further adjudication needs to be undertaken.

5. Accordingly, the writ petition stands disposed of. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.'

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-VI)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

kak

To

The Chief Area Manager,
Indian Oil Corporation Ltd.,
Anna Salai,
Chennai - 600 018.

W.P.No.27464 of 2014

SSV(CO)
RVM(26/11/2021)