

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK**

**WP(C) NO.20143 OF 2022**

***Mamata Gupta***

....

***Petitioner***

Mr.S.Udgata, Adv.

*-versus-*

***Hindustan Petroleum Corporation  
Ltd. & ors.***

....

***Opposite Party(s)***

Mr.S.P.Panda, AGA for State

**CORAM:  
JUSTICE BISWANATH RATH**

**ORDER  
6.9.2022**

**Order No.**

01. 1. The defect pointed out by the S.R. is ignored, as this Court finds, there is sufficient address of O.Ps.4 & 5.
2. Heard learned counsel for the Petitioner.
3. At the threshold the Petitioner volunteers to submit that she is not the applicant in terms of the advertisement, vide Annexure-1. However, finding opportunity of raising objection by any individual, the Petitioner here raised objection on the selection of private O.P. not being in S.E.B.C. Category and has been considered illegally against O.B.C. Category. The Petitioner raising her grievance, the Competent Authority undertook an exercise for considering her grievance and vide Annexure-10 has come to observe as follows :-

“Please note that as per the certificate dated 22/12/2018 submitted by upon as attachment to your letter, Revenue

Officer confirmed that Shri N.Hari Prasad is not belonging to “creamy layer” & the said certificate is for “Petrol Pump Dealership” purpose. Moreover as per your earlier complaint, we verified the certificate submitted by the selected candidate i.e. Shri N.Hari Prasad from Tahasildar, Boipariguda & got confirmation that the certificate has been issued by his office & Shri N. Hari Prasad pertain to “Baliji Community which is recognised as a backward class by State Government of Odisha”.

4. Learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that there is no proper consideration of the allegation of the Petitioner and this is a fit case to be admitted and examined.

5. Considering the submission of the learned counsel for the Petitioner and reading through the observation of the Competent Authority at Annexure-10, this Court finds, after getting into objection of an outsider, there has been enquiry and the Competent Authority came to be satisfied on the basis of confirmation being made by the Public Authority negating the allegation of the Petitioner. In this situation, this Court finds, there is no infirmity in the impugned order requiring to be interfered with. Further this Court observes, involving the impugned action, the Petitioner since not an applicant cannot be prejudiced otherwise.

6. The Writ Petition thus stands dismissed.

**(Biswanath Rath)**  
**Judge**

*M.K.Rout*