

**HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD
(Special Original Jurisdiction)**

**FRIDAY, THE EIGHTH DAY OF DECEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY THREE**

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MRS JUSTICE SUREPALLI NANDA

WRIT PETITION NO: 15946 OF 2011

Between:

Smt.D.Vasantha, W/o Sudharshan, aged 38 years, R/o.H.No.3-1-708, Vavilalapalli,
Karimnagar, Karimnagar District.

.....PETITIONER

AND

1. Indian Oil Corporation Limited, D.No.9-1-83 & 84, S.D.Road, Secunderabad,
Represented by its Chief Divisional Retail Sales Manager.
2. Vipparthi Joshua Rani, D/o Ashirvatham, R/o D.No.4-3-104/10, Achiyamma
Colony, Kovvur Village and Mandal, West Godavari District.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition Under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed therewith, the High Court may be pleased to issue a writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of writ of Mandamus to declare the action of the 1st respondent in entertaining the irregular application of the 2nd respondent and allowing her to participate in the interview even though she did not submit fresh affidavit and not disqualifying her even she committed fraud on the 1st respondent by furnishing false information, suppression of facts and thereafter not selecting the next candidate in the selection list i.e., the Petitioner herein as arbitrary, illegal and consequently direct the 1st respondent to award the retail outlet dealership at Pusai, Adilabad District to the Petitioner by disqualifying the 2nd respondent in the interest of justice.

Counsel for the Petitioner : SRI P.NAGENDRA REDDY

Counsel for the Respondent No.1 : SRI DISHIT BHATTACHARJEE

Counsel for the Respondent No.2 : SRI PRABHAKAR SRIPADA

The Court made the following ORDER

HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUREPALLI NANDA

WRIT PETITION No.15946 of 2011

ORDER:

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Dishit Bhattacharjee, learned standing counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.1 and Mr. Prabhakar Sripada, learned counsel for respondent No.2.

2. The petitioner approached the Court seeking prayer as under:

"to issue a writ order or direction more particularly one in the nature of writ of Mandamus to declare the action of the 1st respondent in entertaining the irregular application of the 2nd respondent and allowing her to participate in the interview even though she did not submit fresh affidavit and not disqualifying her even she committed fraud on the 1st respondent by furnishing false information, suppression of facts and thereafter not selecting the next candidate in the selection list i.e., the Petitioner herein as arbitrary, illegal and consequently direct the 1st respondent to award the retail outlet dealership at Pusai Adilabad District to the Petitioner by

disqualifying the 2nd respondent in the interest of justice."

3. Learned standing counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.1 brings to the notice of the Court that the cause of action in the present writ petition does not survive for adjudication, any more.

4. Recording the said submission of learned standing counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.1, the Writ Petition is dismissed as infructuous. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel, the miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in the Writ Petition shall also stand closed.

**SD/- K.SREERAMA MURTHY
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR**

//TRUE COPY//

di
SECTION OFFICER

To

1. One CC to Sri P.Nagendra Reddy, Advocate [OPUC]
2. One CC to Sri Dishit Bhattacharjee, Advocate [OPUC]
3. One CC to Sri Prabhakar Sripada, Advocate [OPUC]
4. Two CD Copies


SA

GJP

Bsk.

HIGH COURT

DATED:08/12/2023



ORDER

WP.No.15946 of 2011

DISMISSIN G THE W.P

AS INFRUCTUOUS WITHOUT COSTS.

6
BSK
26/12/23.