

(2012) 07 AP CK 0022
In the Andhra Pradesh High Court
Case No : WA No. 877 of 2012

Regoti Mallikarjun

APPELLANT

Vs

Indian Oil Corporation and Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 17-07-2012

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2013) 5 ALD 107

Hon'ble Judges : Pinaki Chandra Ghose, Acting C.J.; Vilas V. Afzulpurkar, J

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : K. Govind, for the Appellant; Deepak Bhattacharjee, SC for IOL for the Respondent Nos. 1 and 2, Government Pleader for Revenue for the Respondent No. 3 and P. Nagendra Reddy, Counsel for the Respondent No. 4, for the Respondent

Judgement

Pinaki Chandra Ghose, Actg.C.J.

1. This writ appeal is directed against an order dated 11.6.2012 passed in WP No. 16404 of 2012, wherein the Hon'ble Single Judge while allowing the writ petition only directed the Revenue Divisional Officer, Sanga Reddy to pass appropriate orders in the matter and to find out whether the 4th respondent is a resident of Municipally Village, duly verifying the record and after giving notice of hearing to the petitioner. It has further been stated that such exercise should be completed within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of the order. The appellant, being aggrieved and dissatisfied with the said order filed this writ appeal.

2. The facts of the case briefly are as follows:

The 1st respondent being Indian Oil Corporation issued a notification dated 30.3.2010 inviting applications for selection of a candidate to run a Rural L.P.G. Distribution Point. Applications were received. The procedure for selection was that a panel of candidates who are found to be eligible is prepared and the lots are drawn to select one of them. The petitioner and the 4th respondent were

found eligible for such selection. It appears that an allegation has been made against the 4th respondent by the writ petitioner that she was never a resident of Munipally Village and that she is a resident of Antharam Village of Munipally Mandal. Such being the question, the Hon"ble Single Judge directed it to be decided by the Revenue Divisional Officer, Sanga Reddy.

3. We do not find that there is any illegality or irregularity in the order passed by the Hon"ble Single Judge, since the writ petitioner along with 4th respondent shall get a chance of being heard before the said officer and the officer will pass a reasoned order in the matter. In these circumstances, we do not find that this writ appeal can be entertained by us, since in our opinion, there is no merit in the writ appeal and it is dismissed.