

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

107

**2024:PHHC:034807
CWP No.3799 of 2024
Date of Decision:12.03.2024**

Dalbir Singh

....Petitioner

VS.

Union of India and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: Mr. Ajay Vijarana, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. Anil Sharma, Senior Panel Counsel
for the Union of India

Mr. Ashish Kapoor, Advocate
for respondents No. 2 and 3

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. On 19.02.2024, the matter came up for consideration before this Court and the following order was passed:-

“The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of communication dated 13.01.2024 (Annexure P-7) whereby his candidature for the allotment of Retail Outlet has been rejected.

The petitioner pursuant to an advertisement applied for allotment of Retail Outlet. The petitioner belongs to Scheduled Caste category and he was the sole applicant, thus, no draw of lots took place and he was selected. He vide communication dated 19.10.2023 was

informed that he has been provisionally selected for the dealership. He was asked to deposit Rs. 30,000/- towards initial security. He was further advised to upload rectified/correct documents for further processing. The Land Evaluation Committee of respondents visited the site offered by petitioner and asked him to submit original documents. The petitioner produced original documents which were available with him, however, respondents vide communication dated 13.01.2024 has rejected candidature of the petitioner on the ground that he has failed to produce original documents and there is variance in the documents submitted by him and application form.

*Lawyers are abstaining from work.
In the interest of justice, adjourned to 12.03.2024.
To be shown in the urgent list.”*

2. Mr. Ashish Kapoor, Advocate, submits that petitioner had applied under Combined Category-1 which is meant for defence personnel and Para Military personnel, who are incapacitated while performing official duty. The petitioner does not fulfill basic requisites of the advertisement, thus, he is not eligible for the allotment of petrol pump.
3. Mr. Ajay Virjania, Advocate, does not dispute the aforesaid fact.
4. In the wake of statement of both sides, the petition stands disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

12.03.2024
paramjit

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes	
Whether reportable:		No