

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.N.RAVINDRAN

THURSDAY, THE 15TH DAY OF OCTOBER 2015/23RD ASWINA, 1937

RP.No. 1114 of 2012 (Y) IN WP(C).33798/2011

AGAINST THE ORDER/JUDGMENT IN WP(C) 33798/2011 of HIGH COURT OF KERALA
DATED 12-03-2012

REVIEW PETITIONER(S):

K.A.NAMEER, S/O. ABBAS, KIZHUVALIPARAMBAIL HOUSE,
P.O. CHERPU WEST, THRISSUR.

BY ADV. SRI.I.DINESH MENON

RESPONDENT(S):RESPONDENTS

1. P.S.AJITHKUMAR, AKHILA TRAVELS AND TRANSPORTS,
13/2003, CHANDRAPURAM, P.O. WALAYAR DAM, PALAKKAD-678624
2. THE SECRETARY, REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY, THRISSUR-680003.

R1 BY ADV. SRI.O.D.SIVADAS
R2 BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SHRI E.M. ABDUL KHADIR

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 15-10-
2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

P.N. Ravindran, J.

R.P.No.1114 of 2012

in

W.P.(C) No.33798 of 2011

Dated this the 15th October, 2015

ORDER

The prayer in this review petition is to review and recall the judgment delivered by me on 12.3.2012 in W.P.(C) No.33798 of 2011.

2. The review petitioner is not a party to the above writ petition which was filed by the first respondent herein praying for a direction to the Secretary, Regional Transport Authority, Thrissur to take steps to issue the stage carriage permit granted by Ext.P1 proceedings dated 8.8.2011 after settling the timings. The writ petition was disposed of by me by the impugned judgment on the basis of the submission made by the learned Government Pleader that a timing conference will be held, the timings settled and the permit issued expeditiously. By the impugned judgment, I directed that steps in that regard be taken within an outer limit of three months from the date on which the writ petitioner produces a certified copy of the judgment before the respondent.

3. The main ground raised in the review petition is that the stage carriage bus which was offered by the writ petitioner, stands registered in the name of someone else and that he is not the registered owner. It is contended that as the writ petitioner is neither the owner nor the lessee of the stage carriage referred to in the writ petition, the writ petition should have been dismissed.

4. When the review petition came up for consideration before me today, learned counsel appearing for the writ petitioner submitted that the grant in favour of the writ petitioner has since been revoked by the Regional Transport Authority, Thrissur and therefore nothing survives to be considered in the review petition.

In the light of the aforesaid development, I am of opinion that the review petitioner can have no subsisting grievance. The review petition is accordingly dismissed as infructuous.

(P.N. Ravindran, Judge.)

kav/