

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI
(SPECIAL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION)**

**MONDAY, THE SIXTEENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY,
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX**

:PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE K SREENIVASA REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO: 15121 OF 2022



Between:

V Radhika, W/o. Sabu Bhaskaran, Aged about 49 years, R/o. D.No.3/1031-1-2, YMR Colony, Proddatur Town, YSR Kadapa District

...Petitioner

AND

1. The Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Rep. by its Chairman / Managing Director, Indian Oil Bhavan, G-9, Ali Yavar Jung Marg, Bandra East, Mumbai, Maharashtra State
2. The Deputy General Manager (RS), Tirupati Division Office, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Near Railway Gate, R.C. Road, Tirupati, Chittoor District
3. The Divisional Retail Head, Tirupati Division Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Near Railway Gate, R.C. Road, Tirupati, Chittoor District
4. P. Gopinath Reddy, S/o. P. Siva Reddy, Aged about 55 years, R/o.D.No.2/552-A, Sastri Nagar, Proddatur Town, YSR Kadapa District
5. Union of India, Rep. by its Joint Secretary, Ministry of Petroleum, Oil and Natural Gases, New Delhi

...Respondents

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is filed praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed therewith, the High Court may be pleased to issue an appropriate Writ, order or direction mostly one which is in the nature of a Writ of Mandamus declaring the inaction of the Respondents in reconstitution of the dealership of M/s. V. Gurivi Reddy by inclusion of the Petitioner for the 51% of the share succeeded by her and in allowing the

Petitioner to run the Retail Petroleum Outlet under the name and style of M/s. V. Gurivi Reddy at Sy.No.622 of Proddatur Village, YSR Kadapa District as illegal, irregular, arbitrary, unreasonable, unjustified, unconstitutional and unsustainable by holding the Petitioner is entitled to run the Retail Petroleum Outlet by having majority share in the Partnership Firm;

IA NO: 1 OF 2022

Petition under Section 151 CPC is filed praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to direct the Respondents 1 to 3 to permit the Petitioner to carry on the business of M/s. V. Gurivi Reddy Dealership Firm at Sy.No.622 of Proddatur Village, YSR Kadapa District, Pending disposal of WP 15121 of 2022, on the file of the High Court.

The petition, coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Petition and the affidavit filed in support thereof and upon hearing the arguments of Sri.SODUM ANVESHA Advocate for the Petitioner, Sri.SAI SANJAY SURANENI Advocate for the Respondents and the Court made the following.

ORDER:

Heard learned counsel for petitioner and learned counsel for respondents.

Learned counsel for respondents 1 to 3 submits that Clause 9 of the Policy Guidelines for Reconstitution of Retail Outlet/SKO-LDO Dealerships deals with dispute in case of induction of nominee/ legal heir/ family member amongst partners. According to the same, if there is any dispute with regard to the induction amongst the surviving/ existing partners, then in such cases the dispute may be resolved expeditiously by the dealership. In such cases, it is obligatory on the part of respondent authorities to issue notice to all the partners calling them for personal hearing to resolve the dispute for operation/ reconstitution of dealership and take an undertaking from the dealership confirming to resolve the dispute within 6 months.

Learned counsel for petitioner submits that no such notice has been issued to her till today..

On the other hand, learned counsel for respondents 1 to 3 submits that earlier about three notices have been issued to petitioner and 4th respondent herein, but none of them turned up, in order to resolve the dispute between them.

Counter affidavit has been filed by 4th respondent herein stating that though he is willing to appear before the respondent authorities, the petitioner did not come forward.

In order to resolve the dispute, this Court directs the respondent authorities to issue a fresh notice to petitioner and 4th respondent herein within a period of two (2) weeks from the date of receipt of this order. On appearance of the petitioner and 4th respondent, the respondent authorities are directed to pass appropriate orders within a period of four (4) weeks thereafter.

Post after six (6) weeks.

SD/- T. SRINIVASA RAO
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//


SECTION OFFICER

For

To,

1. The Chairman/Managing Director, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Indian Oil Bhavan, G-9, Ali Yavar Jung Marg, Bandra East, Mumbai, Maharashtra State.
2. The Deputy General Manager (RS), Tirupati Division Office, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Near Railway Gate, R.C. Road, Tirupati, Chittoor District.
3. The Divisional Retail Head, Tirupati Division Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Near Railway Gate, R.C. Road, Tirupati, Chittoor District.
4. P. Gopinath Reddy, S/o. P. Siva Reddy, R/o.D.No.2/552-A, Sastri Nagar, Proddatur Town, YSR Kadapa District .

5. The Joint Secretary, Union of India, Ministry of Petroleum, Oil and Natural Gases, New Delhi (by RPAD)
6. One CC to SRI. SODUM ANVESHA Advocate [OPUC]
7. One CC to SRI. SAI SANJAY SURANENI Advocate [OPUC]
8. One spare copy

HIGH COURT

SRK,J

DATED:16/02/2026

POST AFTER SIX (6) WEEKS

ORDER

WP.No.15121 of 2022

DIRECTION

