



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

WRIT PETITION NO.13045 OF 2023

Rajendra Ashok Akolkar,
Age : 36 Years,
Occ. Engineer and Contractor,
M/s. Rajendra A. Akolkar,
Shivnagar, Lekha Road,
Savedi, Ahmednagar

..Petitioner

Vs.

The Union of India,
Through its Secretary,
Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas,
A-Wing, Rajendra Prasad Road,
New Delhi
and others

..Respondents

AND

WRIT PETITION NO.13107 OF 2023

Bhaiyyasaheb s/o. Narayan Mune,
Age : 41 Years,
M/s. Sai Enterprises,
Office at Plot No.95, Golden City Centre,
API Corner, Near Prozone Mall,
Aurangabad

..Petitioner

Vs.

The Union of India,
Through its Secretary,
Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas,
A-Wing, Rajendra Prasad Road,
New Delhi
and others

..Respondents

Mr.P.B.Nangare, Advocate for petitioners
Mr.R.P.Bangar, Advocate for respondent no.1
Mr.A.P.Bhandari, Advocate for respondent nos.2 to 6

**CORAM : R.G.AVACHAT AND
ABASAHEB D. SHINDE, JJ.**

DATE : NOVEMBER 13, 2025

ORDER :-

Heard.

2. Both the petitioners had been black-listed/holiday listed for certain wrongs committed by them. The petitioners, thereafter, moved the respondent - Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd. (BPCL) for revocation of the order of holiday-listing. The applications for revocation of the order of holiday-listing have been turned down. The petitioners are, therefore, before this court.

3. The petitioners seek order similar to one passed by this Court in **Writ Petition No.525 of 2024 on 05.08.2024 (M/s. Sunshri Enterprises Vs. The Union of India and ors.)**.

4. The learned counsel for the respondents - B.P.C.L. counters the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners, contending that the petitioners owe the respondent - B.P.C.L. certain dues. The recovery proceedings have already been

initiated in the Civil Court. According to him, the order impugned herein is well reasoned. The parties concerned are the administrative authority and therefore, it is not expected of them to pass orders like judicial orders. He, therefore, urged for dismissal of the petitions.

5. Considered the submissions advanced. Perused the orders impugned herein. A glance at the orders under challenge indicates that no reasons have been assigned for imposing of holiday-listing. Holding listing/blacklisting ordered against the petitioners is for 15 years. Half of the period thereof has now been over. In the meanwhile, the respondent - B.P.C.L. has changed its policy and for the wrong similar to one committed by the petitioners, the period of holiday-listing has been reduced to two years. Needless to mention, the beneficial provision must be extended to the petitioners herein also, more so, when the orders impugned herein are unreasoned; and the period of over seven years of holiday-listing, appear to us to be disproportionate to the wrong to have been committed by the petitioners.

6. In the fitness of things and in view of our earlier order dated 05.08.2025 in the case of **M/s. Sunshri Enterprises** (supra), we allow both the Writ Petitions in terms of the following order:-

- (i) The Writ Petitions are allowed.
- (ii) The orders impugned herein are hereby set aside. Black-listing/holding-listing of the petitioners stands revoked with effect from the date of this order.
- (iii) Needless to mention, all the benefits which have been blocked in view of the orders of holiday listing would now be released in favour of the petitioners.
- (iv) The proceedings initiated by respondent - B.P.C.L. for recovery of dues from the petitioners would necessarily be taken to its logical end.

[ABASAHEB D. SHINDE, J.]

[R.G. AVACHAT, J.]

KBP