

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.709 of 2023

Umesh Chandra Shrikanta Son of Rajaram Prasad Resident of Village and
P.O.-Gulwara, Madhuban, P.S.-Madhuban, District-East Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. through its Chairman, Having its Registered Office at G-9, Ali Yavar Jung Marg, Bandra (East), Mumbai, Maharashtra, India.
2. The Director (Refineries), Indian Oil Corporation Ltd (Refineries Division), Scope Complex, Core-2,7, Institutional Area, Lodhi Road, New Delhi-110003.
3. The Director (HR), Indian Oil Corporation Ltd, Sadiq Nagar, J.B. Tito Marg, New Delhi-110049.
4. The General Manager, Indian Oil Corporation Ltd, Bihar State office, Lok Nayak Jai Prakash Bhawan (5th Floor), Dak Bunglow Chowk, Patna-800001.
5. The Senior Divisional Manager, Retail and Sales, India Oil Corporation Ltd, Maurya Complex, A Block, 3rd Floor, Dak Bunglow Road, Patna-800001.
6. The Assistant Manager, Retail and Sales, India Oil Corporation Ltd, Maurya Complex, A Block, 3rd Floor, Dak Bunglow Road, Patna-800001.
7. The Field Officer, Retail and Sales, India Oil Corporation Ltd, Maurya Complex, A Block, 3rd Floor, Dak Bunglow Road, Patna-800001.
8. The Divisional Retail Sales Manager, Muzaffarpur Divisional Officer, Krishna Complex-Akharaghat Road, Muzaffarpur.
9. Chandrakant Jaiswal Son of Late Jagat Narayan Prasad Resident of Village-Madhuban, P.S.-Madhuban, District-East Champaran.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pravin Kumar, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Avinash Kumar Singh, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 28-03-2023

The petitioner has participated in the selection process
for appointment of a regular retail outlet petrol pump dealership.

In the selection process, the petitioner was declared



unsuccessful and could not be placed in the panel, whereafter he challenged the appointment of the respondent No. 9. After having consciously participated in the selection process the petitioner cannot turn around and challenge the said selection process. The petitioner challenges the allotment given to Respondent No. 9, alleging that Respondent No. 9 was not having the requisite land in his name.

However, this Court finds that there is no such requirement of the land being in name of the applicant alone.

In view thereof, no interference is warranted in the writ petition and the same is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Sanjeev Prakash Sharma, J)

Suraj/-
Item No. 67

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	29.03.2023
Transmission Date	

