

S/L 12
09.04.2026
Court. No. 25
sourav

WPA 8246 of 2026

**M/s. A K Halder
Vs.
The Union of India & Ors.**

*Ms. Pramiti Bandopadhyay
Mr. Rahul Kumar Singh
Ms. Utsa Poddar
Ms. Sneha Sarkar
Mr. Kaushik Bandyapadhyay*

...for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashok Halder

...for the Union of India.

*Mr. Amit Kumar Nag
Ms. Rishita Sarkar*

...for IOCL.

1. The affidavit of service filed in Court today is kept with the record.
2. The petitioner has filed the present writ application challenging the show-cause notice as well as the order of termination dated March 26, 2026. The authorities have issued the show-cause notice to the petitioner on the allegation that the petitioner failed to transfer the ownership as well as the PESO licence of the concerned vehicles within a period of four months from the date of receipt of LOA.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that after receipt of show-cause notice, the petitioner has submitted the reply giving the details that the petitioner has already transferred the ownership as well as the PESO licence but the authorities have not considered the same submitted by the petitioner and passed the impugned order for terminating the contract of the petitioner.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for respondents submits that the petitioner has filed the reply but he has not disclosed the document with regard to the transfer of the ownership and the PESO licence and as such, the authorities have not considered the reply submitted by the petitioner and have passed the impugned order for terminating the contract of the petitioner.
5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that before issuance of the show-cause notice, the respondent authorities have allowed the petitioner to continue with the work and the petitioner has continued with the work. The respondents submit that before issuance of show-cause notice the authorities have allowed the petitioner to continue with the same vehicle with the same registration of the previous owner but the petitioner has to comply with the terms and conditions of the LOA by transferring the ownership and the PESO licence within four months from the date of LOA.
6. Considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for the respective parties.
7. This Court finds that the petitioner in his reply has informed the authorities with regard to the transfer of the ownership as well as the PESO licence but the authorities have not considered the same. It is also the fact that the petitioner though has mentioned the date of transfer but did not disclose any document for transfer.
8. Accordingly, the petitioner is given liberty to file supplementary reply within a week from date by disclosing all the documents to the respondent authorities and the

authorities shall consider the supplementary reply submitted by the petitioner and pass the reasoned and speaking order after giving an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner within a period of three weeks from the date of receipt of this order.

9. In view of the above, the impugned order dated March 26, 2026 is set aside.
10. **WPA 8246 of 2026** is disposed of.
11. As the writ petition is disposed of at the stage of 'Motion' without calling any affidavit, the allegation made in the writ petition deemed to have been denied.
12. Urgent photostat certified copies of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance with all the necessary formalities.

(Krishna Rao, J.)