

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.N.RAVINDRAN

SATURDAY, THE 21ST DAY OF NOVEMBER 2015/30TH KARTHIKA, 1937

RP.No. 72 of 2012 (W) IN WP(C).30586/2011  
-----

AGAINST THE ORDER/JUDGMENT IN WP(C) 30586/2011 of HIGH COURT OF KERALA  
DATED 08-12-2011  
REVIEW PETITIONER(S)/PETITIONER:  
-----

RAZACK  
TAHARATHU VEETIL HOUSE, MALAYAMMA P.O., VANNA ROAD  
KOZHIKODE.

BY ADV. SMT.R.PADMAKUMARI

RESPONDENT(S)/RESPONDENTS:  
-----

1. THE REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY  
KOZHIKODE, REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY, CIVIL STATION  
KOZHIKODE-673020.

2. SECRETARY  
REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY, KOZHIKODE-673020.

3. E.C.ABU  
ELAVANCHALIL HOUSE, P.O.KODUVALLY, KOZHIKODE-673020.

R1 AND R2 BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SMT. ROSE MICHAEL

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 21-11-2015,  
THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

**P.N. Ravindran, J.**

-----  
**R.P.No.72 of 2012 in  
W.P.(C) No.30586 of 2011**  
-----

**Dated this the 21<sup>st</sup> November, 2015**

**ORDER**

The prayer in this review petition is to review and recall the judgment delivered by me on 8.12.2011 in W.P.(C) No.30586 of 2011. The petitioner is a stage carriage operator operating a stage carriage on the route Kunnamangalam – Punnakkal – Thamarassery. The complaint in the writ petition was that though he had filed a complaint against the third respondent, another stage carriage operator, to the effect that he is not adhering to the time schedule allotted to his stage carriage, the official respondents are not taking any action against them. When the writ petition came up for admission hearing before me, learned Government Pleader submitted that the Regional Transport Officer, Kozhikode has taken action pursuant to the complaint filed by the petitioner and issued three check reports to the third respondent. In the light of the said submission, the writ petition was closed. It is the said judgment that is sought to be reviewed.

2. The review petition was admitted and notice ordered to the respondents on 2.2.2012. Registry has reported that though respondents 1 and 2 have been served, the notice issued to the third respondent has been returned with the endorsement "insufficient address". When the review petition was called on for hearing today,

learned counsel appearing for the review petitioner was not present. There was also no representation on his behalf. In such circumstances, the review petition is dismissed for default.

**( P.N. Ravindran, Judge.)**

**kav/**