

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.19997 of 2013

=====

Ajay Kumar Mandal Son Of Deo Narayan Mandal Resident Of Village And
Post Office Parsauni, Police-Station Bisfi, District Madhubani

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Senior Regional Manager, Hintustan Petrlum Corporation Ltd., And
Orthers 6th Floor Lok Nayak Jai Prakash Bhawan, Post Box No. 40, Dak
Bungalow Chowk, Patna- 800001
2. Kundan Kumar 'Son Of Name Not Known' Sales Officer Hindustan
Petroleum Corporation Ltd., Patna L.P.G. Region 6th Floor, Lok Nayak Jai
Prakash Bhawan Box No. 40 Dak Bungalow Chowk, Patna- 800001
3. The District Magistrate, Madhubani
4. The Circle Officer, Bisfi, District Madhubani
5. The District Supply Officer, Madhubani
6. Girijesh Kumar Sr. Deputy Collector, Madhubani
7. Sanjeev Ranjan Jha Alias Rajiv Ranjan Jha Son Of Amarnath Jha Resident
Of Village Genaur, Post Office Genaur, Murlichak, Munni Tola, Police
Station, Bisfi, Out Post Patauna, District Madhubani
8. Kalimuddin Shams Son Of Late Md. Kasim Resident Of Village And Post
Office Parsauni, P.S. Bisfi, District Madhubani

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Najmul Hoda
For the Respondent/s : Mr.S.A. Alam

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A. ABHISHEK REDDY
ORAL ORDER

5 03-07-2023 By way of a writ petition, petitioner has prayed as

under:

*“1. That, this writ application is for
quashing the letter dated 30.03.12 contained in
Annexure-10) issued by the Senior Regional
Manager, H-industan Petroleum Corporation
Ltd. Patna appointing the Respondent no.7 as
Rajiv Gandhi Gramin L.P.G. Vitrak of H.P. Gas
at village Bajraha Parsauni, District*



Madhubani and for quashing the agreement and (Contained in annexure-11) and for quashing the letter dated 5.02.13(Contained in Annexure-17) issued by the Senior Regional Manager, rejecting the representation of the petitioner and for a direction to the Senior Regional Manager to appoint the petitioner as the L.P.G.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner has stated that in spite of specific direction passed by this Court in the CWJC No. 684 of 2012, the official respondents have not considered the case of the petitioner and allotted the dealership to the respondent no. 7 and also rejected the representation of the petitioner.

Per contra, learned counsel for the respondent has stated that the letter of intent was issued to the respondent no. 7 on 31.12.2011 and, thereafter, a letter of appointment was made on 30.04.2012. Further, it is stated that the initial allotment was only for a period of five years from 30.04.2012 and, thereafter, it was renewed on 2017 and 2022. Even though, the matter is of the year of 2013, till date no notices have been issued to the respondent no. 7.

In the counter-affidavit filed by the official respondents, it is made clear that the petitioner was given an opportunity of hearing and, thereafter, orders passed by the



authority concerned rejecting the case of the petitioner.

A perusal of the order shows that the authority concerned duly taking into account the facts that the respondent no. 7 was a resident of Bajraha Parasauni, have allotted dealership to the respondent no. 7.

Having regard to the fact that much water has flown since 2013 and the petitioner has not chosen to challenge the letter of intent nor the letter of appointment issued in favor of the respondent no. 7 and also the subsequent renewal in the year 2017 and 2022. This Court does not find any merit in the present writ petition, which warrants any interference at this point of time. Therefore, the writ petition is dismissed accordingly.

(A. Abhishek Reddy, J)

Ayush/-

U			
---	--	--	--

