

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8548 of 2021

=====

Anamika Devi, Wife of Pankaj Kumar, resident of Mohalla-Sidharth Nagar,
Anaith, Ward No. 43, Police Station-Ara Nawada, District-Bhojpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Indian Oil Corporation Limited through its Secretary, Indian Oil Bhavan, Bandra East, Mumbai (Maharashtra).
2. The Managing Director, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Indian Oil Bhavan, Bandra East, Mumbai (Maharashtra).
3. The Secretary, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Indian Oil Bhavan, Bandra East, Mumbai (Maharashtra).
4. The Deputy General Manager (LPG Sales), Patna Area Office, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Exhibition Road, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Anil Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Lalit Kishore, AG
		Mr. Sanat Kumar Mishra, Advocate
		Mr. S. Raza Ahmad, AAG-5

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH
SHARMA
ORAL JUDGMENT
(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date : 03-01-2022

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

Petitioner has prayed for the following relief(s):-

(D) For issuance of appropriate writ for commanding and directing the respondent authorities to award of LPG Distributorship of IOC at Dihari District- Bhojpur under OBC(W) category advertised on 17-06-2017 accordance with Unified Guidelines for selection of LPG distributor issued by Indian Oil Company.



(E) For issuance of appropriate writ directing and commanding respondent authorities during pendency of present writ application may stay further proceeding in relevant with award of LPG Distributorship of IOC at Dihari District- Bhojpur.

(F) For issuance of any other writ/ writs/ order/ orders to which the petitioner may be found entitled to.”

From the response filed by the Indian Oil Corporation Ltd., it is quite apparent that the LPG Distributorship for location “LPG Gramin Vitarak at Dihari, under Gram Panchayat Shivpur Block- Jagdishpur, District- Bhojpur” stands allotted and commissioned to third party.

In Paragraph 9 of the response filed, it stands clarified that every time the draw of lots was held, parties were informed through e-mail, which communication was generated automatically through e-portal.

Petitioner has concealed such fact from the Court. That apart, we notice that the draw of lots were held six times and on none of the occasions petitioner was found to be successful candidate.

As such, we find no merit in the present petition, which is dismissed.



Interlocutory Application(s), if any, stands disposed
of.

(Sanjay Karol, CJ)

(Sanjeev Prakash Sharma, J)

Amrendra/PKP

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	05.01.2022
Transmission Date	

