

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI

TUESDAY, THE 2ND DAY OF JUNE 2015/12TH JYAISHTA, 1937

WP(C).No. 13260 of 2015 (F)

PETITIONER:

**SUBAIR PAKKO,
KAYAMPARAMBIL HOUSE,
PERINGALA P.O, ERNAKULAM.**

BY ADV. SRI.P.DEEPAK

RESPONDENT:

**THE REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY,
MUVATTUPUZHA,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
MUVATTUPUZHA - 686661.**

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SMT.K.A.SANJEETHA

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

mbr/

WP(C).No. 13260 of 2015 (F)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS:

**EXHIBIT P1: TRUE COPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE RESPONDENT
DATED 13.2.2015.**

**EXHIBIT P2: A TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 25.3.2014 IN WPC NO.8554
OF 2014.**

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS:

- NIL

/TRUE COPY/

P.S. TO JUDGE

mbr/

A.V. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI, J.

W.P.(C) No. 13260 of 2015

Dated this the 2nd day of June, 2015

J U D G M E N T

The petitioner applied for grant of regular permit to conduct service between Aluva and Kothamangalam via Perumbavoor. The petitioner alleges that the application was considered by the respondent in the meeting held on 13.02.2015 and there was no objection whatsoever to grant permit. However, few other route operators objected to the timings proposed; and therefore, they prayed for a settlement of timings. It was further pointed out that the respondent heard the matter and reserved for orders. Now, more than two months elapsed after the date of consideration of the issue by the respondent. The apprehension of the petitioner is that his application for regular permit would be rejected by the respondent for the sole reason that the petitioner has not specified any particular vehicle in his application for permit. It is in

..2..

this context, the petitioner has come up before this Court.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the learned Government Pleader in the matter.

3. The matter is no longer res integra with the authoritative pronouncements of this Court. It has been declared that the applicant need not offer a ready vehicle at the time of submitting the application. Therefore, this Court is of the view that while passing orders on the application of the petitioner, the same shall not be rejected for the sole ground that the petitioner has not made mention of the name of the vehicle in the application.

The writ petition is disposed of as above.

Sd/-
A.V. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI
JUDGE

bka/-