

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

**WRIT PETITION NO.2910 OF 2018  
NAHID TABSSUM AZIM KADRI  
VERSUS  
THE UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS**

...

Advocate for the Petitioner : Shri Tapse Ashok R.  
AGP for Respondent 2 : Shri P.K. Lakhotiya  
Advocate for Respondent 3 : Ms.Anjali Dube (Bajpai)  
Advocate for Respondent 4 : Shri A.D. Wange  
Advocate for Respondent 5 : Shri Anand P. Bhandari

...

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE**

**&**

**ARUN R. PEDNEKER, JJ.**

**DATE :- 19<sup>th</sup> August, 2022**

**Per Court :-**

1. The petitioner concedes that respondent No.3 has been wrongly arrayed in this petition. He seeks permission to delete respondent No.3. Deletion is permitted and to be carried out forthwith.

2. Having considered the submissions of the learned advocates for the respective sides, it appears that the petitioner is aggrieved by the fact that the application filed by respondent No.4 was against the Rules. An applicant can file only one application for seeking allotment of the Retail Outlet for the LPG distributorship. Respondent No.4 has submitted two applications. He, however, concedes that there is no specific rule which

indicates that, if one applicant files more than one application for the same location, such applicant would stand disqualified and all his applications would stand automatically rejected.

3. The learned advocate representing the Company relies upon the affidavit in reply dated 25.06.2019 and points out from the list of applicants found eligible for the selection of LPG distributorship, that there is a specific note at the bottom of the said list which indicates that “*if one candidate has submitted multiple applications for same location, only one application will be considered at the time of draw.*”. He further submits that when the draw of lots was carried out, respondent No.4 was treated as a single applicant and as such, the second application stood ignored/rejected. Moreover, the allotment has already reached fruition four years ago.

4. In view of the above, we do not find that respondent No.5 Company has indulged in any illegality in the selection of respondent No.4.

5. This Writ Petition being devoid of merit is, therefore, dismissed.