

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.VINOD CHANDRAN

FRIDAY, THE 6TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2015/17TH MAGHA, 1936

WP(C).No. 3647 of 2015 (E)

PETITIONER(S):

IMMANUEL JOSEPH, KUZHITHOTTU HOUSE,
CHETHIMATTAM, PALA PO., KOTTAYAM DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.SAJEEV KUMAR K.GOPAL

RESPONDENT(S):

1. THE REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY, AGED 58 YEARS
KOTTAYAM 686001 REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY
2. THE SECRETARY, THE REGIONAL
TRANSPORT AUTHORITY, KOTTAYAM 686001
3. BOBBY GEORGE,
KANIYAMKUNNEL HOUSE, BHARANANGANAM, PALA
PIN-686578
4. THE KERALA STATE ROAD TRANSPORT CORPORAQTION,
REPRESENTED BY ITS DISTRICT TRANSPORT OFFICER,
KOTTAYAM- 686 001

BY SRI.P.C.CHACKO, SC, KERALA STATE ROAD TRANSPORT CORPN.
BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI. BIJU MEENATTOOR

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 06-02-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:

WP(C).No. 3647 of 2015 (E)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT P1: TRUE COPY OF THE REGULAR PERMIT IN RESPECT OF THE
STAGE CARRIATE BEARING REGISTRATION NO.KL 05/P 6444

EXHIBIT P2: TRUE COPY OF THE REGULAR PERMIT IN RESPECT OF THE
STASGE CARRIATE BEARING REGISTRATION NO.KL 05/P 6030

EXHIBIT P3: TRUE COPY OF THE REGULAR PERMIT IN RESPECT OF THE
STASGE CARRIATE BEARING REGISTRATION NO.KL 05/U-9081

EXHIBIT P4: TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT IN MVARP.349/2013 OF THE
STATE TRANSPORT APPELLATE TRIBUNAL ERNAKULAM DATED 24.7.2014

EXHIBIT P5: TRUE COPY OF THE MINUTES OF THE TRAFFIC ADVISORY
COMMITTEE

EXHIBIT P6: TRUE COPY OF THE DECISION OF THE 1ST RESPONDENT AT ITS
MEETING HELD ON 6.11.2014 IN ITEM NO.8

//True Copy//

P.A. To Judge

K.VINOD CHANDRAN, J

W.P.(C).No. 3647 of 2015

Dated 6th February, 2015

JUDGMENT

The petitioner challenges the grant of a regular permit as per Ext.P6 which is said to be purportedly in compliance of the directions in Ext.P4 order of the Tribunal. The petitioner's contention is that, the order of the Tribunal was to file a modified application and without such a modified application on record, permit was granted merely on an application being submitted. These are all facts which could be looked into in a validly instituted revision. This Court would not look into such facts under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Leaving open such remedy, the writ petition would stand dismissed.

Sd/-

K.VINOD CHANDRAN
Judge

Mrcs

//True Copy//