

# Bombay Oil Industries vs Union Of India on 14 November, 1983

**Equivalent citations: 1984 AIR 160, 1984 SCR (1) 815**

**Author: Y.V. Chandrachud**

**Bench: Y.V. Chandrachud, E.S. Venkataramiah, R.B. Misra**

PETITIONER:  
BOMBAY OIL INDUSTRIES

Vs.

RESPONDENT:  
UNION OF INDIA

DATE OF JUDGMENT 14/11/1983

BENCH:  
CHANDRACHUD, Y.V. ((CJ))  
BENCH:  
CHANDRACHUD, Y.V. ((CJ))  
VENKATARAMIAH, E.S. (J)  
MISRA, R.B. (J)

CITATION:  
1984 AIR 160                      1984 SCR (1) 815  
1984 SCC (1) 141                1983 SCALE (2) 816  
CITATOR INFO :  
RF                      1987 SC1564 (2)  
E                        1990 SC1744 (4)

ACT:  
Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969 -  
Ss. 21, 22 and 23-Objectors must be supplied with relevant  
materials-Government must give good reasons in support of  
its order.

HEADNOTE:  
HELD: The faith of the people in administrative  
tribunals can be sustained only if the tribunals act fairly  
and dispose of the matters before them by well considered  
orders. Refusal to furnish relevant materials to the  
objectors can amount to denial of reasonable opportunity and  
violation of natural justice. [816 C & E]

JUDGMENT :

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION: Civil Appeal No. 3191 of 1983.

WITH S.L.P. (CIVIL) No. 4311 of 1983.

From the Judgment and Order dated the 30th November, 1982 passed by the Govt. of India u/s.22 of the Monopolies & Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969 bearing No.2/18/80-M- II.

Anil B. Divan and B.V. Desai for the Appellant. B. V. Desai for the petitioner.

P. R. Mridul, Ravindra Narain, D. N. Misra and Ashok Sagar for the respondent in C. A. No. 3191/83.

M. L. Talukdar, C.V. Subba Rao and R. N. Poddar for the respondent.

D.N. Misra and R. N. Poddar for the respondent in S.L.P. No.4311/83.

The Order of the Court was delivered by CHANDRACHUD, C. J. The order of the Government dated November 30, 1982 which is impugned in these proceeding leaves much to be desired. But we do not propose to admit the appeal since after hearing a longish argument from Shri Anil B. Divan on behalf of the appellant, we are satisfied on the material produced before us and on perusal of the counter affidavit of the Government that, there were good reasons for passing the impugned order. We must, however, impress upon the Government that while disposing of applications under Sections 21, 22 and 23 of the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969 it must give good reasons in support of its order and not merely state its bald conclusion. The faith of the people in administrative tribunals can be sustained only if the tribunals act fairly and dispose of the matters before them by well considered orders. The relevant material must be made available to be objectors because with out it, they cannot possibly must the claim or contentions of the applicants under Sections 21, 22 and 23 of the MRTP Act. The refusal of the Government to furnish such material to the objectors can amount to a denial of a reasonable opportunity to the objectors to meet the applicant's case. And denial of a reasonable opportunity to meet the other man's case is denial of natural justice.

On the question of the need to give reasons in support of the conclusions to which the Government has come, the authorities concerned may, with profit, see the Judgments of this Court in *Union of India v. Mohan Lal Capoor & Ors.*, *Siemens Engineering & Manufacturing Co. of India Limited v. Union of India & Ans.* and *Uma Charan v. State of Madhya Pradesh & Anr.*

With these observations we dismiss the special leave petition and the appeal.

H.L.C.

Petition dismissed.

