



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI
(Special Original Jurisdiction)**

[3328]

FRIDAY, THE FIFTH DAY OF DECEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE GANNAMANENI RAMAKRISHNA
PRASAD**

WRIT PETITION NO: 33736 OF 2010

Between:

1. SRI VIGNESWARA INDANE (LPG DISTRIBUTOR OF IOCL), REP. BY ITS PROPRIETRIX, B. MADHAVI, W/O. VENKATABHUSHANAM PORANKI, PENAMALURU MANDAL, KRISHNA DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE UNION OF INDIA REP BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVT, DEPT. OF PETROLEUM & NATURAL GAS CENTRAL SECRETARIAT, NEW DELHI.
2. M/S HINDHUSTHAN PETROLEUM CORPORATION LTD, REP. BY ITS DIRECTOR (MARKETING) NO. 8, SURJI VALLABHA MARG, MUMBAI.
3. THE REGIONAL MANAGER, M/S. HINDHUSTHAN PETROLEUM CORPORATION LTD. KONDAPALLI, LPG, R.O. HPCL., INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AREA, KONDAPALLI,
4. M/S BHARAT PETROLEUM CORPORATION LTD, REP. BY ITS DIRECTOR (MARKETING) BELLARD ESTATE, MUMBAI.
5. THE TERRITORY MANAGER, M/S. BHARAT PETROLEUM CORPORATION LTD. KATTUBADI PALEM (PO), PINAPAKA VILLAGE, KONDAPALLI,
6. M/S INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LTD, REP. BY ITS DIRECTOR (MARKETING) HEAD OFFICE, 9-ALIYAWAR JUNG MARG,

BANDRA, MUMBAI.

7. THE SENIOR AREA MANAGER, INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LTD.
INDANE AREA OFFICE, II FLOOR, GVR TOWERS, BHARATIYA
NAGAR,
8. SRI LALITHA DEVI GAS AGENCIES, REP. BY ITS PROPRIETOR, M.
SUDHAKAR RAO (LPG DISTRIBUTOR OF HPCL), D.NO. 56-50-04,
GANAPATHI TEMPLE STREET, PADAMATA,
9. RATNA AGENCY, REP. BY ITS PROPRIETOR, J. PADMANABHAM
(LPG DISTRIBUTOR OF HPCL), D.NO. 6-9-1, BANDAR ROAD,
KANKIPADU VILLAGE & MANDAL,
10. MADAVA ENTERPRISES, REP. BY ITS PROPRIETOR,
NIMMAGADDA SUBBA RAO (LPG DISTRIBUTOR OF HPCL), D.NO.
40-1-68, OPP. EENADU, PADAMATA, VIJAYAWADA - 520 010,
11. USHA KIRAN BHARAT GAS AGENCIES, REP. BY ITS
PROPRIETRIX, D. BHULAKSHMI (LPG DISTRIBUTOR OF HPCL),
D.NO. 386/4, GOLLAGUDEM ROAD, KANKIPADU VILLAGE &
MANDAL,

...RESPONDENT(S):

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. K ANANDA RAO

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. M RAVINDRANATH REDDY (SC FOR HPCL)
2. ASHOK RAM V
3. THOOM SRINIVAS
4. DEPUTY SOLICITOR GENERAL OF INDIA
5. O MANOHER REDDY
6. T SRINIVAS

The Court made the following ORAL ORDER:

Heard Sri Deva Deepak, Ld. Counsel appearing on behalf of Sri K. Ananda Rao, Ld. Counsel for the Writ Petitioner.

2. The prayer sought in the present Writ Petition is as under:

“In the light of the facts stated above it is prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to issue a writ, order or direction more in the nature of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ declaring the action of the Respondents 2 to 5 in not preventing the unofficial Respondents 8 to 11 from operating their business activities in supplying the LPG Cylinders within 15 kms. radius of Penamaluru Mandal, Krishna District within the exclusive area of operation of the Petitioner and not transferring the customers list in the said area to the Petitioner as illegal, arbitrary contrary to the guide lines issued by the Govt. of India Petroleum & Natural Gas and contrary to the Judgment rendered by this Hon'ble Court in W.P.No.9787 of 2005 and batch dt.23-01-2006 and consequentially pass appropriate orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.”

3. The above extract would indicate that the Writ Petitioner has challenged the action of the Respondent Nos.2 to 5 in not preventing the Unofficial Respondent Nos. 8 to 11 from operating their business activities in supplying the LPG Cylinders within 15 Kms radius.

4. The docket would indicate that this Court has not granted any interim relief to the Writ Petitioner. Since this Writ Petition is of the year 2010, the above extract would indicate that the Unofficial Respondents would have been carrying on their business for more than 15 years and therefore this Court is of the view that the cause does not survive.

5. Accordingly, this Writ Petition is disposed of as having become infructuous. No order as to costs. However, liberty is granted to the Writ

Petitioner to restore this present Writ Petition to its' file within eight (08) weeks from today, if the Writ Petitioner is of the opinion that the cause still survives.

6. Registry is directed to not to destroy the record for a period of twelve (12) weeks. If the Application for restoration is not filed within eight (08) weeks from today, the Registry is at liberty to destroy the record thereafter.

7. Interlocutory Applications, if any, stand closed in terms of this order.

GANNAMANENI RAMAKRISHNA PRASAD, J

Dt: 05.12.2025
Mnr

148

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE GANNAMANENI RAMAKRISHNA PRASAD

WRIT PETITION No.33736 OF 2010

Dt: 05.12.2025
Mnr