

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI

THURSDAY, THE 4TH DAY OF JUNE 2015/14TH JYAISHTA, 1937

WP(C).No.16735 of 2015 (N)

PETITIONER:

**C.V.SIYAD,S/O.AHAMMED,C.V.LAND,P.O.VENGAD,
KUTHUPARAMBA,THALASSERY.**

BY ADV. SRI.O.D.SIVADAS

RESPONDENT:

**THE SECRETARY,REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY,
KANNUR-670001.**

BY GOVT. PLEADER SMT.K.A.SANJEETHA.

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 04-06-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

pk

WP(C).No.16735 of 2015 (N)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:

EXT.P1:TRUE COPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS DATED 11.2.2015.

EXT.P2:TRUE COPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS DATED 14.7.2010.

EXT.P3:TRUE COPY OF THE REQUEST DATED 26.5.2015.

RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS:

NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.S. TO JUDGE

pk

A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI, J.

=====

W.P(C) No.16735 of 2015

=====

Dated this the 4th day of June, 2015

JUDGMENT

Aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the respondents in taking action on Ext.P2 request submitted by him, the petitioner has come up before this Court.

2. The petitioner is an existing stage carriage operator, operating on the route between Kannur and Mattannoor. The petitioner alleges that the permit is issued in respect of stage carriage bearing No.KL-58 G/5149 and the present permit is valid till 13.2.2018. He applied for variation of regular permit by extending the route from Keezhalloor to Vengad and by reducing the single trip on the portion Keezhalloor to Mattannoor without curtailing the existing operation of the vehicle.

3. The application was considered by the Regional Transport Authority in the meeting held on 11.2.2015 and variation was granted

subject to the settlement of timing. The petitioner further alleges that his application is highly beneficial to the passengers to Vengad and it does not affect any other operators. It is further alleged that since the sector Keezhalloor to Vengad is an ill served sector, there would not be any difficulty in accommodating the petitioner without disturbing the existing departure time from Kannur at 6.40 pm.

4. The petitioner further alleges that though a timing conference was convened, the same could not be culminated on account of the objection raised by the petitioner and other operators. Therefore, the petitioner submitted Ext.P2 before the respondents. However, no action has been taken on Ext.P2.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Pleader.

Considering the nature of the relief sought for and the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, this writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to consider

and pass appropriate orders on Ext.P2 request after affording the petitioner an opportunity of being heard within one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment.

To facilitate early action, it shall be open to the petitioner to produce a copy of this judgment and a copy of the writ petitioner along with Ext.P2 before the respondent concerned at the earliest.

Sd/-

A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI
JUDGE

krj