IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P.(C) No.6612 of 2025

Subhasini Hansda, aged about 59 years, wife of Mohril Murmu, Resident of Village- Sundarpur, P.O Kathalia, Gram Panchayat Kathalia, P.S Masalia, Kathalia, District Dumka, Jharkhand **…. …. Petitioner**

-Versus-

1. Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd., through its territory manager, Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd. Ranchi Retail Divisional Office, NIEL Complex, 3rd Floor, H.B. Road, Near Kantatoli Chowk, at & P.O Kantatoli, P.S Lalpur, District Ranchi, Jharkhand

2. Arvind Prasad Sahu, son of Ramratan Sahu, Resident of Village Tamtam Tola, P.O & P.S., Balumath, District Latehar, Jharkhand

…. …. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR

For the Petitioner : Mr. Subodh Kumar Pandey, Advocate
For the Resp.-BPCL : Mr. Mrinal Kanti Roy, Adv.

02/Dated: 02nd December, 2025

1. Heard the parties.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for following reliefs:-

> ***"(A)*** *For issuance of an appropriate writ(s), order(s) or direction(s) commanding upon respondent authority to specially the respondent no.1, to renew the lease of the petitioner and handover the petrol pump dealerships as per the terms and conditions of the agreement held dated 21.10.2010 for the authorized by the BPCL. It is further submitted that since January 2025, the petrol pump/outlet is complete closed due to mismanagement conducted by the private respondent no.2, now the petitioner fill-up all terms and conditions of the agreement held on 21.10.2010 in-spite of that the respondent has not help to open the petrol pump/ outlet which is closed since January, 2025 is arbitrary, unjust and against the Article 19 & 21 of the Constitution of India.*

(B) *For issuance of an appropriate writ(s), order(s) or direction(s) commanding upon the respondent authority to look out the matter the petitioner filed the several representations even that all the due amount clear by the petitioner now it is the duty of the respondent specially the BPCL to renew the lease of the outlet dealership as early as possible as because the petitioner now face the crises and heavy economic loss regarding the clearance of GST and others relevant issues for the running of the outlet/dealership as per the rules and regulations*."

3. After some arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the present writ petition with a liberty to work out his remedy in accordance with law.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents has raised no objection.

5. Permission is granted. Accordingly, the present writ petition is hereby, disposed of as withdrawn with the aforesaid liberty.

(Rajesh Kumar, J.)

02nd December, 2025
Raja/-Uploaded on 03.12.2025