

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
INHERENT JURISDICTION**

REVIEW PETITION (CIVIL) NOS. 402-403 OF 2026

IN

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. 12218-12219 OF 2025

DATTATRAY EKNATH MORE

PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LTD. & ORS.

RESPONDENT(S)

R1 INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LTD.

R2 SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER, DISTRICT NASHIK

R3 STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

O R D E R

Heard Ms. Sneha Sanjay Botwe, learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Vikarmjit Banerjee, learned Additional Solicitor General for the respondent no.1 and Mr. Sourav Singh, learned counsel for the respondents no.2 and 3.

2. The present Review Petitions have been filed against the order dated 24.09.2025 passed by this Court in Civil Appeals No.12218-12219 of 2025 filed by the respondent no.1 herein, which were allowed and the order of the High Court impugned therein dated 04.02.2020 in Writ Petition No.802 of 2015 directing the respondent no.1 herein to give employment to the present review petitioner at a post commensurate to the qualifications which he possess and as

required for the post to be offered, was set aside. Aggrieved thereby, the review petitioner has filed these review petitions seeking employment under the scheme floated by the respondent no.1 for grant of employment in lieu of the land being acquired.

3. *Vide* order dated 11.03.2026, this Court had allowed the prayer for oral hearing of the review petitions and directed their listing in the Court only on the ground that the review petitioner has raised a point that the appeals of the respondent no.1 were allowed on one of the grounds that no similarly situated person had been granted such employment, which according to the review petitioner was incorrect and there is an instance of one other person, whom the review petitioner claims to be similarly situated and has been granted such employment.

4. The respondent no.1 has filed various affidavits in the present Review Petitions and ultimately the undisputed position today before the Court is, that the other person was not similarly situated as he otherwise fulfilled the requisite educational qualification for being considered for such employment, which the review petitioner did not possess.

5. In the aforesaid background, we find that the issue now has to be given a quietus. Accordingly, the Review Petitions stand dismissed.

6. However, the present order will not come in the way of the review petitioner, if he seeks employment in future, which shall be considered on its own merits in accordance with law.

7. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

.....J.
(AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH)

.....J.
(S.V.N. BHATTI)

NEW DELHI
SEPTEMBER 09, 2026

ITEM NO.302

COURT NO.9

SECTION III

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

R.P.(C) NOS. 402-403/2026

IN

C.A. NOS. 12218-12219/2025

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 24-09-2025
in C.A. Nos. 12218-12219/2025 passed by the Supreme Court of India]

DATTATRAY EKNATH MORE

PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LTD & ORS.

RESPONDENT(S)

[PART-HEARD BY : HON. AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH AND HON. S.V.N. BHATTI,
JJ.]

FOR ADMISSION

Date : 09-09-2026 These petitions were called for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.V.N. BHATTI

For Petitioner(s) :Ms. Sneha Sanjay Botwe, AoR
Mr. Ranjit G. Jadhav, Adv.
Mr. Siddharth S. Chapalgaonkar, Adv.
Mr. Akash Tripathi, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :Mr. Vikarmjit Banerjee ASG/Sr. Adv.
Mr. Indranil Ghosh, Adv.
Mr. Palzer Moktan, Adv.
Mr. Advait Ghosh, Adv.
Ms. Aanchal Tikmani, AoR
Mr. Mujadid Gilani, Adv.
Mr. Ritik Pathak, Adv.

Mr. Sourav Singh, Adv.
Mr. Aaditya Aniruddha Pande, AoR
Mr. Siddharth Dharmadhikari, Adv.

Mr. Shrirang B. Varma, Adv.
Ms. Chitransha Singh Sikarwar, Adv.

O R D E R

The Review Petitions are dismissed in terms of the
signed order, which is placed on the file.

(POOJA SHARMA)
AR-CUM-PS

(ANJALI PANWAR)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR