

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI

MONDAY, THE 25TH DAY OF MAY 2015/4TH JYAISHTA, 1937

WP(C).No. 15326 of 2015 (M)

PETITIONER(S) :

- 1. SUHAIL P,
PULINJICKAL, CHEERAMCHIRA P.O.,
CHANGANACHERY.**
- 2. ZEENATH NAZAR,
ALAYIL THOPPIL, 13TH WARD, CHANGANACHERY,
KOTTAYAM.**

BY ADV. SRI.STALIN PETER DAVIS

RESPONDENT(S) :

- 1. THE SECRETARY,
REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY
KOTTAYAM - 686 001.**
- 2. SAJI GEORGE JOHN,
USHUS, THRUTHY P.O., CHANGANACHERY- 688 521.**

R1 BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SMT.K.A.SANJEETHA

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 25-05-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

Msd.

WP(C).No. 15326 of 2015 (M)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS

- P1: A TRUE OF THE TIMING CONFERENCE DATED 18.05.2015.**
- P2: A TRUE OF THE OBJECTION FILLED BY THE 1ST PETITIONER BEFORE
THE 1ST RESPONDENT ON 22.05.2015.**
- P3: A TRUE OF THE OBJECTION FILED BY THE 2ND PETITIONER BEFORE
THE 1ST RESPONDENT ON 23.05.2015.**
- P4: A TRUE OF THE SIMILAR JUDGMENT IN W.P.(C).NO.69/2015.**

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS

NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.A.TO JUDGE.

Msd.

A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI, J.

=====

W.P(C) No.15326 of 2015

=====

Dated this the 25th day of May, 2015

JUDGMENT

The petitioners, who are stage carriage operators, operating on the route Thottabhagam-Anjilithanam-Paippad-Changanacherry and Thiruvamma Private Bus Stand-Paippad-Kunnamthanam-Perunna Private Bus Stand respectively allege that they have submitted Exts.P2 and P3 objections respectively in accordance with law as per Rule 212 of the Kerala Motor Vehicles Rules, 1989.

2. Today when the matter came up, the learned counsel for the petitioners confined his argument to the limited prayer for a direction to the first respondent to consider Exts.P2 and P3 objections submitted by the petitioners.

3. I have heard the learned Government also in the matter.

4. Considering the nature of the relief sought for, this Court is of the view that the writ petition can be disposed of even without

issuing notice to the second respondent.

Therefore, the writ petition is disposed of directing the first respondent to consider the objections submitted by the petitioners also while settling the timings of the bus of the second respondent.

Sd/-

A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI
JUDGE

krj