

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

THURSDAY, THE SEVENTH DAY OF DECEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY THREE

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MRS JUSTICE SUREPALLI NANDA

WRIT PETITION NO: 15457 OF 2011

Between:

V. Venkatanarasimha Rao, S/o. Guravaiah, aged 37 years, Occ: business
R/o.H.No.3-181, Nidamanuru (V&M) Nalgonda District

...PETITIONER

AND

1. The Hindusthan Petroleum Corporation Ltd., Rep. by its Chief Regional Manager (Retail), Secunderabad Retail Regional Officer, 130/1, Sebastian Road, S.D.Road, Secundabad - 500 003
2. Senior Regional Manager (Retail), Hindusthan Petroleum Corporation, Vijayawada, Mangalagiri Road, Near Saibaba Temple, Tadepalli, Guntur District
3. Sri Vemarapu Narsimhulu, S/o. Venkata Subbaiah, Business R/o. Nakirekal (V&M), Nalgonda 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 writ or direction preferably writ of Mandamus declaring the inaction of the respondent nos. 1 and 2 corporation in finalizing the selections and not selecting the petitioner for awarding Retail Outlet as illegal, arbitrary, contrary to guidelines and violative of principles of natural justice and consequently direct the respondent Nos. 1 and 2 to award retail out let under Hamara Pump (in rural market) in respect of location no.500 of Nidamanuru 2Km Stretch On Miryalaguda - N.Sagar Raod, Nalgonda District in favor of the petitioner in view of guidelines dt.28.02.2006 and also declare the "Residence eligibility criteria" for Hamara Pump (rural retail outlets) stipulated in clause 4(4) of the Guidelines of the Respondent Corporation for selection of Retail Outlet dealers as arbitrary, illegal and contrary to the guidelines dt.28.2.2006 issued by

the ministry of Petroleum and consequently set aside the order dt. 19.7.2011 passed by the Grievance Redressal Committee of the respondent corporation.

Counsel for the Petitioner: SRI. KOWTURU PAVAN KUMAR

Counsel for the Respondent No.3: SRI C. VENKAT YADAV

Counsel for the Respondent Nos. 1&2: SRI THOOM SRINIVAS, SC

The Court made the following: ORDER

HON'BLE MRS JUSTICE SUREPALLI NANDA

WRIT PETITION No.15457 OF 2011

ORDER:

The petitioner approached this Court seeking the relief as under:

"To issue writ or direction preferably writ of Mandamus declaring the inaction of the respondent nos. 1 and 2 corporation in finalizing the selections and not selecting the petitioner for awarding Retail Outlet as illegal, arbitrary, contrary to guidelines and violative of principles of natural justice and consequently direct the respondent Nos. 1 and 2 to award retail out let under Hamara Pump (in rural market) in respect of location no.500 of Nidamanuru 2Km Stretch On Miryalaguda N Sagar Road, Nalgonda District in favour of the petitioner in view of guidelines dt.28-02-2006 and pass such other order or orders as this Hon'ble Court deems fit and proper in the circumstances of the case."

2. It is represented by Mr.Thoom Srinivas, learned Standing Counsel appearing on behalf of respondent Nos.1 and 2 that the Retail out let has been running by respondent No.3, since 28.03.2012.

3. Mr. C.Venkat Yadav, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent No.3 brings to the notice of this

Court that the cause of action in the present writ petition does not survive for adjudication any more.

4. Bringing the said submissions of learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 3 on record, the present writ petition is dismissed as infructuous. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this Writ Petition, shall stand closed.

**SD/- P. CH. NAGABHUSHAMBA
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR**

//TRUE COPY//


SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. One CC to SRI. KOWTURU PAVAN KUMAR, Advocate [OPUC]
2. One CC to SRI. C. VENKAT YADAV, Advocate [OPUC]
3. One CC to SRI. THOOM SRINIVAS, STANDING COUNSEL [OPUC]
4. Two CD Copies

B M
GJ



HIGH COURT

DATED:07/12/2023

ORDER

WP.No.15457 of 2011



DISMISSING THE WRIT PETITION AS INFRUCTUOUS
WITHOUT COSTS

(6)
MBC
27/12