

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

101-2 cases

2023:PHHC:150690

Date of Decision:28.11.2023

CWP No.22 of 2018

Nirmala Devi

....Petitioner

VS.

Union of India and others

....Respondents

CWP No.776 of 2018

Sharmila Devi

....Petitioner

VS.

Union of India and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: Mr. Nishchal Chetanya Manchanda, Advocate for
Mr. Jagdish Manchanda, Advocate
for the petitioner in both the petitions

Mr. Ashish Kapoor, Advocate
for respondents No. 2 to 4 in both the petitions

Mr. Rajnish Gupta, Advocate
for respondents No. 5 in both the petition

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. By this common order, CWP No. 22 of 2018 and CWP No. 776 of 2018 are hereby adjudicated as common questions of law and facts are involved. With the consent of both sides, facts are borrowed from CWP No. 22 of 2018.

2. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of selection of respondent No. 5 as LPG distributor under SC (W) category.

3. The Indian Oil Corporation Limited (in short "IOCL")
advertised LPG distributorship at Bhuna, District Kaithal under SC(W)

category alongwith 52 other locations in the State of Haryana. The petitioner, like other candidates, applied for the distributorship. Draw of lots took place on 15.11.2017. The respondent No. 5 came to be selected. The petitioner is assailing selection of respondent No. 5 for distributorship of LPG. The petitioner made a representation to IOCL against selection of respondent No. 5. The IOCL adverted with all the allegations of the petitioner and did not find any substance in the allegations. Accordingly, distributorship was allotted to respondent No. 5.

4. Learned counsel for IOCL submits that gas agency stands allocated to respondent No.5 who is operating since 2018. The corporation had allotted distributorship to respondent No.5 after adverting with all the issues raised by the petitioner. The respondent-corporation found all the allegations of the petitioner against respondent No.5 incorrect and baseless.

5. Faced with this, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he has no instruction from his client and petitions may accordingly be disposed of.

6. The respondent No. 5 is operating since 2018 and IOCL at no stage has found fault in her allotment. Thus, in the wake of statements of both sides, the petitions stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

28.11.2023
paramjit

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether reportable: Yes/No