

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.VINOD CHANDRAN

TUESDAY, THE 28TH DAY OF APRIL 2015/8TH VAISAKHA, 1937

WP(C).No. 13104 of 2015 (K)

PETITIONER :

**SAJIMON THOMAS,
THEKKILAKATTIL HOUSE, MARANAGATTUPPALLY, PALA,
KOTTAYAM, REPRESENTED BY THE POWER OF
ATTORNEY HOLDER SAM THOMAS,
THEKKILAKKATIL HOUSE, PALAKKATTUMALA KARA,
MEENACHIL TALUK, KOTTAYAM DIST.**

BY ADV. SRI.K.V.GOPINATHAN NAIR

RESPONDENT :

**THE SECRETARY,
REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY,
KOTTAYAM, PIN- 686 002**

BY SR GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.G.GOPAKUMAR

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 28-04-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

sts

WP(C).No. 13104 of 2015 (K)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS

**EXT.P1: TRUE COPY OF THE REGULAR PERMIT ISSUED TO THE PETITIONER
ON THE ROUTE PALA-VELLOOR VALID UP TO 8/4/2012**

**EXT.P2: TRUE COPY OF THE REGULAR PERMIT APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY
THE PETITIONER DATED 9/2/2015**

**EXT.P3: TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER
FOR GRANT OF 4 MONTHS TEMPORARY PERMIT DATED 9/2/2015**

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS: NIL

/TRUE COPY/

P.A.TO JUDGE

sts

K.VINOD CHANDRAN, J.

=====

W.P.(C).No.13104 of 2015

=====

Dated this the 28th day of April, 2015

JUDGMENT

The petitioner contends that he was a permit holder in the route Pala-Velloor valid up to 08.04.2012. Admittedly, no application for renewal was given within time. Subsequently, the petitioner has now applied for a permit by Ext.P2 dated 09.02.2015. Simultaneous to the said application, an application for temporary permit was also given. The petitioner seeks expeditious consideration of the same.

2. The fact that the petitioner had an earlier regular permit in the very same route does not at all give the petitioner a right to make a fresh application. The authority would have to look at whether any other permits were issued in the very same route as also in the defaulted service. In any event, the application for

regular permit and temporary permit having been filed only in the month of February, 2015, this Court is of the opinion that as of now there is no warrant for issuance of mandamus. If there is any unreasonable delay caused, the petitioner would be entitled to move for appropriate reliefs.

With the above observation, the writ petition would stand closed.

**Sd/-
K.VINOD CHANDRAN,
JUDGE.**

stu