

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI

TUESDAY, THE 26TH DAY OF MAY 2015/5TH JYAISHTA, 1937

WP(C).No. 15317 of 2015 (L)

PETITIONER(S) :

SUNIL MATHAI,
THANDELPUTHENPURAYIL HOUSE,
PANNOOR P.O., THOTTAKKUZHA,
THODUPUZHA, IDUKKI.

BY ADV. SRI.G.PRABHAKARAN.

RESPONDENT(S) :

1. THE SECRETARY,
REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY,
IDUKKI - 685 602.
2. THE REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY,
IDUKKI - 685 602,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SMT.K.A.SANJEETHA.

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 26-05-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:

rvs.

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S) ' EXHIBITS :

EXPT.P1 TRUE COPY OF THE EXISTING TEMPORARY PERMIT FOR THE
PERIOD 30.1.2015 TO 29.05.2015 DATED 23.1.2015.

EXPT.P2 TRUE COPY OF THE TEMPORARY PERMIT APPLICATION DATED
15.5.2015 ON THE ROUTE CHEPPUKULAM SCI CHURCH-VAIKOM
WITH STAGE CARRIAGE KL 6/B 8285 IN PLACE OF KL 6/C 9627.

EXPT.P3 TRUE COPY OF THE CHELAN RECEIPT DATED 15/5/2015.

EXPT.P4 TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 17/12/2014 IN WPC NO.
34193/2014.

RESPONDENT(S) ' EXHIBITS :

NIL.

/TRUE COPY/

P.A.TO JUDGE

RVS.

A.V. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI, J.

W.P.(C) No. 15317 of 2015

Dated this the 26th day of May, 2015

J U D G M E N T

Aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the respondent in considering Ext.P2, the petitioner has come up before this Court.

2. The petitioner alleges that the route between Cheppukulam SCI Church - Vaikom was being operated by KL 6/C 9627 on the basis of a regular permit, which could not be renewed. Hence, the route is not being operated now. The petitioner alleges that he is the owner of a tax paid idle vehicle bearing Reg.No.KL 6/B 8285; and he is operating the same route on the basis of Ext.P1, which expires on 29.05.2015. The petitioner applied for reissue of temporary permit; and a temporary permit was earlier granted pursuant to the directions of this Court. According to him, if the permit is not issued, it will cause difficulties to the public.

..2..

3. I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Pleader in the matter.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner confined his argument to the limited prayer for a direction to the 1st respondent to consider and pass appropriate orders on Ext.P2 application within a time frame.

Considering the nature of the submission, this writ petition is disposed of directing the 1st respondent to consider and pass appropriate orders on Ext.P2 application after affording the petitioner an opportunity of being heard, within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment.

To facilitate an early action, the petitioner shall be at liberty to produce a copy of this judgment as well as a copy of this writ petition before the 1st respondent at the earliest.

Sd/-
A.V. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI
JUDGE

bka/-