



W.P(MD)No.13412 of 2014

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 19.07.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.R.SWAMINATHAN

W.P(MD)No.13412 of 2014
and
M.P.(MD)No.1 of 2014

Tamilarasan

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.Indian Oil Corporation Limited,
Represented by its Chief Area Manager,
Indane Area Office,
No. 2, Race Course Road,
Chokkikulam, Madurai- 2.

2.Senthil Selvan

... Respondents

Prayer : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India,
praying this Court to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for
the records relating to the impugned letter of the 1st Respondent in file
No.MAO/798/13 dated 21.02.2014 quash the same and direct the
1st Respondent to reconsider the written objection of the petitioner dated
30.11.2013 and cancel the Gad Agency/Award given to the



W.P(MD)No.13412 of 2014

2nd Respondent under Rajiv Gandhi Gramin LPG Vitrack (RGGIV) at
Keelapavoor (TP) District Tirunelveli.

For Petitioner : No appearance

For Respondents : Mr.K.Muraleedharan,
Standing Counsel for R1.
Mr.P.Venkatesan for R2.

ORDER

The learned counsel who filed the writ petition originally is no more. Mr.Sathiya Singh who is taking care of the bundles of Late.Shri.Senthur Pandian had informed the petitioner to make alternative arrangements. He states that the petitioner is said to be not responding.

2.The first respondent issued notification dated 29.05.2013 inviting applications for dealership from eligible candidates for awarding LPG distributorship. The petitioner was one of the applicants. However in the draw of lots, the second respondent turned out to be successful.



W.P(MD)No.13412 of 2014

Questioning the selection of the second respondent, the petitioner made a few allegations. They were enquired into by the first respondent and by the impugned communication, the petitioner was informed that the allegations have not been substantiated. This communication dated 21.02.2014 sent by the corporation is put to challenge in this writ petition.

3.I went through the contents of the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition. The allegations are factual in nature. It is not for the Writ Court to re-appreciate the factual issues. I do not find any ground to interfere and the writ petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

19.07.2023

NCC : Yes/No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes/ No
ias



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)No.13412 of 2014

G.R.SWAMINATHAN, J.

ias

W.P(MD)No.13412 of 2014

19.07.2023