

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM**

**PRESENT:**

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.VINOD CHANDRAN**

**THURSDAY, THE 12TH DAY OF MARCH 2015/21ST PHALGUNA, 1936**

**WP(C).No. 6236 of 2014 (D)**  
-----

**PETITIONER :**  
-----

**MURALI M.V., RADHA BHAVAN,  
NARIPARAMBA P.O., THAVANNUR VIA,  
MALAPPURAM.**

**BY ADV. SRI.G.PRABHAKARAN**

**RESPONDENTS :**  
-----

- 1. THE REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY, MALAPPURAM  
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY-678 505.**
- 2. THE SECRETARY  
REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY, MALAPPURAM-668 505.**
- 3. SUBRTAMANIAN T.  
S/O NARAYANAN, 15/263, THALAKAT HOUSE,  
P.O. EDAPPAL, MALAPPURAM-679 576.**
- 4. THE STATE TRANSPORT APPELLATE TRIBUNAL,  
ERNAKULAM-682 016.**

**BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI. R. RANJITH**

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD  
ON 12-03-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED  
THE FOLLOWING:**

**bp**

WP(C).No. 6236 of 2014 (D)  
-----

**APPENDIX**

**PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS**  
-----

EXHIBIT P1: THE TRUE COPY OF THE REQUEST RECEIVED DATED 30.5.2011.

EXHIBIT P2: TRUE COPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE RTA MALAPPURAM  
WITHITS NO.C/29919/2010M DATED 22.12.2010.

EXHIBIT P3: TRUE COPY OF THE REVISION PETITION IN M.V.A.R.P NO.170/2011  
DATED 24.5.2011.

EXHIBIT P4: TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 7.9.2013 IN MVARP NO.170/2011.0

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS : NIL.  
-----

//TRUE COPY//

P.A. TO JUDGE

bp

**K. VINOD CHANDRAN, J**

-----  
**W.P(C) No. 6236 of 2014**  
-----

**Dated this the 12<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2015**

**J U D G M E N T**

The petitioner is allegedly aggrieved by the curtailment of the route of the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent by Ext.P2. The petitioner moved an application for revision before the State Transport Appellate Tribunal by Ext.P3. The allegation was that the service was introduced between Guruvayoor and Kadampuzha at the request of the travelling public and that the specific route takes in many important temples and curtailment now made between Kuttipuram and Kadampuzha adversely affects the travelling public.

2. The permit itself was granted long back and there would definitely be considerable services introduced in the sector, after the permit was granted. Probably that is one of the reason why curtailment was sought and was allowed by Ext.P2. In any event the RTA allowed the curtailment after considering the relevant aspects. In such circumstances, it does not lie in the mouth of a passenger to contend that the curtailment is against public interest. This Court would not

say anything on the ground on which the revision was rejected, being the petitioner not having locus standi. The petitioner does not put forth any convincing reason why he is aggrieved by the variation granted by the RTA. In any event, running of a stage carriage in a route is the prerogative of the permit holder and an authority has looked into the permit and allowed the curtailment. In such circumstance, this Court would not cause any interference in the matter.

Writ petition is dismissed.

Sd/-

(K. VINOD CHANDRAN, JUDGE)

jma

//true copy//

P.A to Judge