



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 10-03-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE S. M. SUBRAMANIAM

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K. SURENDER

WA Nos. 1822 & 1840 of 2023

B.Dakshayani

..Appellant(s) in both
petitions

Vs

1. The Regional LPG Manager (south)
Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited, No.1,
Renganathan Gardens, 11th Main Road, Anna
Nagar (West), Chennai-600 040.
2. The Territory Manager,
LPG, Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited,
Post Box No.1644, Peelamedu, Coimbatore.
3. The Selection Committee,
Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd,
Post Box No. 1644 Peelamedu, Coimbatore.
4. G.Kayal Sundar

..Respondent(s) in both
petitions

W.P.No.1822 of 2023: Writ Appeal filed under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent
to Set aside the order dated 24.01.2023 in WP.Nos. 26249 of 2012.

W.P.No.1840 of 2023: Writ Appeal filed under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent
to Set aside the order dated 24.01.2023 in WP.Nos. 8616 of 2013.

For Appellant(s):

For Respondent(s):

Mr.R.Vivekanandan

Mr.O.S.Karthikeyan for R1-3

Mr.V.Sharan for

Mr.M.Aravindan FOR R4

**COMMON JUDGMENT****(Judgment of the Court was delivered by S.M.Subramaniam J.)**

WEB COPY

The writ orders dated 24.01.2023 in WP.No.24249 of 2012 and W.P.No.8616 of 2013 are under challenge in the present writ appeals.

2. Appellant submitted an application pursuant to the advertisement issued by Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited (BPCL) on 15.06.2010 for appointment of LPG distributorship at Palladam, Coimbatore District. 4th respondent was also a contesting candidate. Selection committee assessed relative merits between the candidates, who submitted applications seeking LPG Distributorship at Palladam.

3. Admittedly, 4th respondent scored highest marks, selected and appointed. Appellant even before Selection Committee filed a complaint and an enquiry was conducted by the competent authority. Grounds raised by the appellant is that he possessed experience of 23 years but the selected candidate possesses the experience of 21 years was not taken into consideration by the Selection Committee.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant even before this Court reiterated by stating that appellant possess additional better qualification than that of the candidate appointed, and all the documents produced to establish the merits were not considered by the Selection Committee.



5. Power of judicial review of the High Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India cannot be extended to interfere with the relative assessment made by the Selection Committee, unless the decision taken is in violation of the statutory provisions or not in consonance with the established principles. It is the prerogative of the Selection Committee to make relative assessment based on the documents produced by the candidates and in accordance with the guidelines issued by the Oil Corporation. In the present case, appellant though raised an allegation of bias, there is no material available on record to establish any such bias. Therefore, learned Single Judge found that the appellant has not established any acceptable ground for the purpose of interfering with the selection. The reasoned order of the Writ Court is sufficient to form an opinion that there is no infirmity or perversity in respect of the decision taken.

6. Consequently, the writ petition is dismissed. No costs. The connected miscellaneous petitions, if any, are closed.

(S.M.S.,J.) (K.S.,J.)
10-03-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

GD



To

1. The Regional Lpg Manager (south)
Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited, No.1,
Renganathan Gardens, 11th Main Road, Anna
Nagar (West), Chennai-600 040.
2. The Territory Manager,
LPG, Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited,
Post Box No.1644, Peelamedu, Coimbatore.
3. The Selection Committee,
Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd, Post Box
No. 1644 Peelamedu, Coimbatore.



WEB COPY

WA Nos. 1822 & 1840 of 2



**S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.
AND
K.SURENDER, J.**

GD

WA Nos. 1822 & 1840 of 2023

10-03-2026