

16.7. 2024
item No.11
n.b.
ct. no.24

WPA 8018 of 2019

Debashish Manna.
Vs.
Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd. & Ors.

Mr. Puspendu Chakraborty,
..... for the BPCL.

None appears on behalf of the petitioner.

Mr. Puspendu Chakraborty, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent no.1 to 5 submits that the petitioner has challenged the commissioning of LPG distributorship in favour of the respondent no.6.

Mr. Chakraborty further submits that the entire procedure adopted by the concerned authority is as per brochure and direction thereof; the challenge of the present petitioner regarding the procedure adopted by the Oil Company is not tenable. He further submits that the present petitioner may have understand the fate of the writ petition. Thus, he did not turn up.

It is the further submission of Mr. Chakraborty that the commissioning of LPG distributor in favour of the private respondent no.6 has been concluded in the year 2021. At this juncture, he further submits that the writ petition became infrustuous.

Heard Mr. Chakraborty, it appears that the present petitioner is not appearing before this Court in earlier few

occasions. However, considering the merit of this matter, it appears to me that the present petitioner may have not interested to proceed with the matter. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed for default.

Interim order, if any, passed by this Court during pendency of this matter is also vacated.

All parties shall act on the server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official website of this Court.

(Subhendu Samanta, J.)