
(1989) 07 P&H CK 0101
In the Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh
Case No : Civil Writ Petition No. 8016 of 1988

Ravinder Pal Singh

APPELLANT

Vs

Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. and others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 28-07-1989

Acts Referred:

Constitution of India, 1950 — Article 226

Citation : (1989) 07 P&H CK 0101

Hon'ble Judges : Amrit Lal Bahri, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : M.J.S. Sethi with Mr. Harpal Singh, for the Appellant; S.C. Kapur, for the Respondents No. 1 and 2 and Mr. M.R. Midha, for the Respondent No. 3, for the Respondent

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

A.L. Bahri, J.—Ravinder Pal Singh resident of Fazilka challenges in this writ petition filed under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India, the action of the Indian Oil Corporation and Chairman, Oil Selection Board, Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 respectively for grant of dealership/distributorship of LPG (Gas).

2. Ravinder Pal Singh claims to be an Engineering Graduate having passed B.E (Mechanical) from Punjab University in 1982. He was unemployed and was eligible for the grant of dealership for which he moved the application, Annexure P-1 is the advertisement for inviting applications for the said purpose which is dated 7.12.1984, Respondent No. 3, Daljit Singh Gagneja also filed application for the said purpose. In his application, he had stated in the column meant for giving his occupation as "Bio-Chemist at Private Lab". With regard to the experience, he gave the information "Supervision in Private Lab". As per procedure, the applications were processed and applicants were interviewed by Oil Selection Board. In the preliminary selection, three persons were selected. The Petitioner, Respondent No. 3 and Laxmi Narain, these three persons were further asked at a subsequent stage to produce relevant documents concerning

their applications. At that stage, it was found that Laxmi Narain was not eligible for the dealership. Out of the two remaining candidates, the Board selected Respondent No. 3.

3. The case of the Petitioner in the writ petition is that Respondent No. 3 was employed and he took a somersault by filing an affidavit that he was not employed and the Board in an illegal and arbitrary manner selected him. On the other hand, the stand of the Indian Oil Corporation and the Board is that at the time of interview, it transpired that Respondent No. 3 was helping his brothers in the laboratory and as such was not employed. It was in this view of the matter that he was asked to file supplementary affidavit and he did so. Similar reply has been given by the Respondent No. 3 in the written statement.

4. On going through the material produced in the case, I find that the order of the Board in allowing dealership to Respondent No. 3 is not at all against the terms and conditions of the advertisement issued. It was entirely upto the Board to select one of the eligible candidates for granting dealership. Even if Daljit Singh was self-employed and the income of his family was less than Rs. 24,000/- per annum, he was eligible.

5. Finding no merit in the writ petition, the same is dismissed. No costs.