

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**

**WPC No. 2242 of 2015**

- Tajender Singh Bedi, S/o Shri Indrajeet Singh, Aged About 36 Years, R/o Sitapur, Ambikapur District Surguja ( Chhattisgarh )

**---- Petitioner**

**Versus**

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Transport, Mantralaya, New Raipur, Chhattisgarh
- Regional Transport Authority, Ambikapur, District Surguja ( Chhattisgarh )
- Smt. Devanti Gupta, W/o Jagdamba Prasad Gupta, Bus Operator, Sitapur Bus Stand, Surguja ( Chhattisgarh )

**---- Respondents**

---

|                           |                                |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
| For Petitioner            | : Shri Santosh Gupta, Advocate |
| For Respondent No.1/State | : Shri Majid Ali, P.L.         |
| For Respondent No.2 & 3   | : None present.                |

---

**Hon'ble Shri Justice Pritinker Diwaker**

**Order On Board**

**15/12/2015**

Grievance of the petitioner is that against the grant of one interstate permit and one regional permit in favour of respondent No.3, the petitioner has made complaint under Section 86 of the Motor Vehicles Act before respondent No. 2 but till date his complaint has not been decided.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that purpose of filing this petition would be served if at this stage the petitioner may be permitted to withdraw this petition with liberty to pursue his pending application. He however, prays for direction to respondent No.2 to decide the pending application of the petitioner expeditiously.

State counsel has no objection to the preposition as put forth by the petitioner. He however submits that the pending application of the petitioner would be decided strictly in accordance with law considering all the aspects of the case after giving opportunity to respondent No.3.

The petitioner is permitted to withdraw this petition with the aforesaid liberty. If respondent No.2 has already decided the pending application of the petitioner, the same may be decided expeditiously in accordance with law after affording opportunity to respondent No.3.

It is made clear that this Court has observed nothing on merits of the case and it would be for respondent No.2 to act strictly in accordance with law.

Sd/-  
Pritinker Diwaker  
Judge