

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3983 of 2024

=====

Aman Kumar son of Ram Vilash Mahto, Resident of Gandhi Nagar, Road No. 6, Bairiya, P.O.-Paighambarpur Kolhua, P.S. Ahiyapur, District-Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Indian Oil Corporation Limited through its Chairman cum Managing Director, G-9, Ali Yavar Jung Marg, Bandra (East), Mumbai.
2. The Chief General Director, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Bihar State Office, Plot No. -A-6, Patliputra Industrial Area, Patna-800013.
3. The Executive Director, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Plot No. -A-6, Patliputra Industrial Area, Patna-800013.
4. The Chief Divisional Officer, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Muzaffarpur Divisional Office, Krishna Complex, Akharaghat Road, Muzaffarpur-824001.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sunil Kumar Pathak, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Ankit Katriar, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A. ABHISHEK REDDY
ORAL ORDER

2 15-03-2024 Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

2. The main grievance of the petitioner is that pursuant to the advertisement given for appointment of an RO dealership, the petitioner has applied for the same. However, the authorities have rejected the application of the petitioner solely on the ground that the offered land falls on NH-139W while the advertised location is for SH-74.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has stated that the Road Construction Department has clarified that the land offered by the petitioner is falling on SH-74 and to that effect



the petitioner has also given a representation (Annexure-P/9) dated 29.04.2024 bringing it to the notice about the clarification issued by the Road Construction Department. Therefore, learned counsel has prayed this Hon'ble Court to direct the authorities to consider the representation made by the petitioner and take a suitable decision with regard to the application made by the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent-Corporation has stated that the authorities will consider the representation made by the petitioner and duly take into consideration the clarification issued by the Road Construction Department and take necessary decision on the application made by the petitioner.

5. Having regard to the above made submissions, without going into merits or demerits of the case, the present writ petition is disposed of directing the respondent-Corporation to consider the representation made by the petitioner duly taking into consideration the clarification issued by the Road Construction Department and reconsider the application of the petitioner for RO dealership. The entire exercise shall be completed as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this



order.

6. Even though, the counsel for the petitioner has prayed that till such time the decision is taken by the authorities, interim directions restraining the respondents from issuing fresh notification may be granted. This Court is not inclined to pass any order as per the redressal grievance mechanism, the authorities are bound to redress the grievance of the petitioner before issuing any fresh advertisement.

7. With the above direction, the present writ petition stands disposed of.

(A. Abhishek Reddy, J)

Ayush/-

U			
---	--	--	--

