



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

115

LPA-2077-2025 (O&M)

Decided on : 03.11.2025

PARAMJEET KAUR

. .Appellants.

Versus

INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LTD. AND OTHERS . . Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI**

PRESENT: Mr. Vikas Singh, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Vishesh Singh Mor, Advocate for the appellants.

Mr. Ashish Kapoor, Advocate and
Mr. M. S. Rana, Advocate
for respondents No. 1 & 2.

Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Sandhya Gaur, Advocate for respondent No. 3.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (Oral)

1. In the present appeal, the challenge is to the impugned order dated 04.02.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge, by which, the civil writ petition No. 3125-2025 filed by the appellant with the prayer that the appellant be allowed to continue to run the petrol station, which was allotted to the respondent No.3 by the respondent No. 1- Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. and which was further given to appellant on lease, was rejected by the learned Single Judge and the writ petition filed by the appellant has been dismissed.

2. Learned Senior counsel for the appellant argues that in case, respondent No. 3 was not within the jurisdiction to grant the sub-lease of said petrol pump in favour of the appellant, action should be taken against



respondent No. 3 by the respondent No. 1- Indian oil Corporation ltd., whereas, the appellant has been restrained from running the petrol station which was allotted to respondent No. 3 by respondent No. 1- Indian Oil Corporation ltd..

3. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the case file with their able assistance.

4. The petrol Station allotted by respondent No. 1- Indian Oil Corporation can only be run by an allottee. The allottee does not have the right to sublease the said petrol station further, which is in the present case has been done by respondent No. 3 in favour of the appellant, as has been claimed by the appellant herein.

5. Once, there is no allotment by respondent No. 1- Indian Oil Corporation ltd. in favour of the appellant which could allow him to run a particular petrol station, the prayer of the appellant to allow him to continue to run the said petrol station, which was concededly allotted to respondent No. 3 by respondent No. 1- Indian Oil Corporation ltd., has rightly been rejected by the learned Single Judge, while passing the impugned order dated 04.02.2025

6. With regard to the contention of appellant qua taking action against the respondent No. 3 by respondent No. 1- Indian Oil Corporation ltd. for his act of subleasing the outlet in favour of the appellant, the said discretion only lies with respondent No. 1- Indian Oil Co-operation ltd. keeping in view the terms and conditions of the agreement which was entered into between the respondent No. 3 and respondent No. 1 -Indian Oil Corporation ltd..

7. It may be noticed that the appellant has no right to claim for



any such direction, but, the Indian Oil Corporation ltd. will be free to initiate any action against respondent No. 3, in case, the act of subletting of petrol station in favour of the appellant is proved at the hands of respondent No. 3.

8. Hence, keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, no ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the facts and circumstances of the present case as the order impugned is not proved to be perverse.

9. Accordingly, the present appeal is dismissed.

10. Pending civil miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

03.11.2025

Riya

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*

Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*