

(2025) 10 GAU CK 1149
In the Gauhati High Court
Case No : WP(C) Of 6853 Of 2024

Dipak Kumar Das

APPELLANT

Vs

Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd And 6 Ors

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 27-10-2025

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2025) 10 GAU CK 1149

Hon'ble Judges : Devashis Baruah, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : B. Choudhury, B. Gogoi, S. Borthakur

Final Decision : Disposed Of

Judgement

Devashis Baruah, J

1. Heard Mr. B. Choudhury, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Petitioner and Mr. S. Borthakur, the learned Standing counsel appearing on behalf of the Respondent Nos. 1 and 2. I have also heard Mr. B. Gogoi, the learned Additional Advocate General, Assam who appears on behalf of the Respondent Nos. 6 and 7. None appears on behalf of the Respondent Nos. 3, 4 and 5.

2. The Petitioner herein has approached this Court being aggrieved by the impugned letter dated 01.11.2024 whereby the Petitioner's application for Selection of Service Provider for Bharat Petroleum Corporation's Company Owned Company Operated (COCO) Service Provider at BP Shrirampur, Kokrajhar was rejected; not to give effect to the letter dated 01.11.2024; directing the Respondent Authorities for reconsidering the Petitioner's application in terms with the guidelines prescribed in the Brochure dated 15.12.2023; issuance of directions upon the Respondent Nos. 6 and 7 to forward the Petitioner's nomination for Selection of Service Provider for Bharat Petroleum Corporation's Company Owned Company Operated (COCO) Service Provider at BP Shrirampur, Kokrajhar in accordance with the directives contained in the letter dated 05.04.2024 and Advisory dated 18.09.2024 issued by the Directorate General

Resettlement, Ministry of Defence, Government of India; and in the alternative, directing the Respondent Authorities to cancel the selection process for Selection of Service Provider for Bharat Petroleum Corporation's Company Owned Company Operated (COCO) Service Provider at BP Shrirampur, Kokrajhar pending appropriate amendments in the Guidelines contained in the Brochure dated 15.12.2023 by the Respondent No.1 in accordance with the directives contained in the letter dated 05.04.2024 and Advisory dated 18.09.2024 issued by the Directorate General Resettlement, Ministry of Defence, Government of India.

3. Mr. S. Borthakur, the learned Standing counsel appearing on behalf of the Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 submitted that the competent authority have accorded approval for cancellation of the selection process for Service Provider for BP, Shrirampur. He further submitted that this very aspect of the matter is therefore brought to the attention of this Court so that the Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 can take appropriate action in accordance with law. In that regard, he has placed before this Court an Email dated 27. 10.2025 issued by the Senior Manager, Legal, BPCL which is kept on record and marked with the letter "X".

4. This Court further takes note of that the Respondent No.6 has also filed an affidavit-in-opposition wherein it was mentioned that the Directorate General of Resettlement's letter dated 05.04.2024 was neither addressed nor received by the Respondent No.6. It was further mentioned that the KSB letter dated 12.04.2024 was received on similar lines of that of the Respondent No.4's letter. In addition to that, it was stated that the Respondent No.2 had approached and handed over the letter to the then Director, Directorate of Sainik Welfare, Assam for volunteer Ex-Servicemen, for managing an existing petrol pump at Shrirampur, Assam. The, then Director, acting in good faith and as a welfare measure for Ex-Servicemen, wrote to all Zilla Sainik Welfare Officials for details of volunteer Ex-servicemen for the job. On receipt of four volunteers, the same was forwarded to the Respondent No.2 vide DSW letter dated 26.06.2024. It was regretted by the Respondent No.6 that while doing so, the KSB letter dated 12.04.2024 was not taken into consideration due to oversight.

5. Taking into account that the Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 who are the settling authority have taken a decision for cancellation of the selection process which have been impugned in the instant proceedings and there is a move to go ahead with the fresh selection proceedings by following the extant policies and guidelines, this Court is of the opinion that nothing further survives in the instant writ petition.

6. Accordingly, the instant writ petition stands closed thereby taking on record the decision of the Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 for cancellation of the selection process which is impugned in the instant proceedings as well as the stand of the Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 that fresh selection would be done in accordance with the extant policies and guidelines.

7. Interim order passed earlier stands vacated.