

GAHC010015062026



undefined

THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)

Case No. : WP(C)/401/2026

NAMITA SHARMA
W/O PUTUL SHARMA
RESIDENT OF VILLAGE NO. 2, BORBIL GAON, PS DIGBOI, DIST TINSUKIA
ASSAM

2: SHRI DARSHAN SARMA

S/O PUTUL SHARMA
RESIDENT OF VILLAGE NO. 2
BORBIL GAON
PS DIGBOI
DIST TINSUKIA ASSA

VERSUS

THE UNION OF INDIA
REP BY THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. OF INDIA, MINISTRY OF
PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS, NEW DELHI 110001

2:THE INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LIMITED

SCOPE COMPLEX
LODHI ROAD
NEW DELHI 110003

3:THE GENERAL MANAGER.
INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LIMITED
EASTERN REGIONAL OFFICE GARIAHAT ROAD
DHAKURIA
KOLKATA 700068

4:THE CHIEF PLANT MANAGER

INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LIMITED

LPG BOTTLING PLANT
GOPANARI
TINSUKIA DISTRICT
ASSAM
786170

5:THE SENIOR MANAGER

QC
QC LAB GAUHATI REFINARY
NOONMATI
GUWAHATI ASSAM 781020

6:THE SENIOR MANAGER (QC)
INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LIMITED
ASSAM OIL DIVISION
DIST DIBRUGARH
ASSAM 786171

7:THE MANAGING DIRECTOR

IOCL DIGBOI
DIST TINSUKIA
ASSA

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR S H MAHMUD, MR. M U MAHMUD,V KHAKHALARY,H R KHAN,MR. M ALI

Advocate for the Respondent : DY.S.G.I., SC, OIL

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR MEDHI

ORDER

30.01.2026

Heard Shri M.U. Mahmud, learned counsel for the petitioners.

The petitioners who are 2 (two) in numbers are the wife and son of one Putul Sarma, who is the sole proprietor of M/S Prasanna Welding Industries and was engaged in various works with the IOCL, Digboi. The sole proprietor had however

gone missing on 12.08.2025 for which an *Ejahaar* was lodged.

The police had however registered the FIR as a kidnapping case on 28.08.2025. The grievances of the petitioners are with regard to non release of dues for works done with the IOCL, not allowing the petitioners to continue the existing works and also with an apprehension that the firm in question may be blacklisted.

Let notice be issued, returnable on 20.02.2026.

Ms. B. Sarma, learned CGC accepts notice on behalf of the respondent no. 1 whereas Shri M. Sharma, learned counsel assisting Shri M.K. Choudhury, learned Senior Counsel accepts notice on behalf of respondent nos. 2 to 7.

Extra copies of the writ petition be served upon the learned counsel for the respondents within 2 (two) working days from today.

Shri Mahmud, the learned counsel for the petitioners prays for an interim order. The same is however opposed by the learned Senior Counsel for the IOCL.

Since it is not in dispute regarding missing of the sole proprietor from 12.08.2025 for which an FIR is also registered, this Court is of the opinion that taking a recourse to blacklist the firm would not be in the interest of justice or even proper.

In view of the same, it is directed that till the returnable date, no steps be taken to blacklist the proprietorship firm.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant