

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.VINOD CHANDRAN

THURSDAY, THE 22ND DAY OF JANUARY 2015/2ND MAGHA, 1936

WP(C).No. 2355 of 2015 (T)

PETITIONER(S):

**P.K.SANTHOSH,
PROPRIETOR, GREEN LINE EXPRESS, ROOM NO.3, T.M.COMPLEX
CHANDRA NAGAR, PALAKKAD - 678 007.**

**BY ADVS.SRI.G.HARIHARAN
SRI.PRAVEEN.H.
SMT.N.C.SALINI
SRI.JAIDEEP S**

RESPONDENT(S):

- 1. REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY,
PALAKKAD - 678 001, REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY.**
- 2. SECRETARY,
REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY, PALAKKAD - 678 001.**
- 3. KERALA ROAD TRANSPORT CORPORATION, PALAKKAD,
REPRESENTED BY THE DISTRICT TRANSPORT OFFICER
PIN - 678 001.**

**R1 & 2 BY SENIOR GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.BIJU MEENATTOOR
R3 BY SRI.P.C.CHACKO, SC, KSRTC**

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 22-01-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

PJ

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS

- EXHIBIT P1. TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION FOR GRANT OF REGULAR PERMIT TO OPERATE ON THE ROUTE PALAKKAD STADIUM BUS STAND - NELLIAMPATHY.**
- EXHIBIT P2. TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER MADE IN MVARP.NO.137/2011 DATED 03.10.2013 BY THE STATE TRANSPORT APPELLATE TRIBUNAL.**
- EXHIBIT P3. TRUE COPY OF THE REGISTRATION CERTIFICATE RELATING TO BUS NO.KL-9AE-399.**
- EXHIBIT P4. TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT MADE IN W.P.(C)NO.22498/2014 DATED 18.09.2014.**
- EXHIBIT P5. TRUE COPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE RTA, PALAKKAD FORWARDED ON 2/12/14 TO THE PETITIONER.**
- EXHIBIT P6. TRUE COPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE SECRETARY, RTA PALAKKAD MADE ON 6/9/08 ISSUING PERMIT TO THE PETITIONER TO OPERATE ON THE ROUTE PALAKKAD-NELLIYAMPATHY VIA THENKURISSY**
- EXHIBIT P7. TRUE COPY OF THE INFORMATION GIVEN BY THE R3 UNDER THE RIGHT TO INFORMATION ACT**
- EXHIBIT P8. TRUE COPY OF THE INFORMATION DATED 6/12/10 ISSUED FROM THE R2 OFFICE.**

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS

NIL.

/ TRUE COPY /

P.S. TO JUDGE

PJ

K. VINOD CHANDRAN, J

W.P(C) No. 2355 of 2015

Dated this the 22nd day of January, 2015

J U D G M E N T

The petitioner seeks invocation of extraordinary remedy under Article 226. Since there is an alternative remedy available, the petitioner definitely, would have to invoke that. The discretion to exercise power under Article 226 declined.

Sd/-
(K. VINOD CHANDRAN, JUDGE)

jma

//true copy//

P.A to Judge