

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI

MONDAY, THE 8TH DAY OF JUNE 2015/18TH JYASHTA, 1937

WP(C).No. 17004 of 2015 (A)

PETITIONER(S) :

**RABEESH,
RASNALAYAM, CHEEKILODE P.O., ATHOLI,
KOYILANDY.**

BY ADV. SRI.I.DINESH MENON

RESPONDENT(S):

**THE SECRETARY,
REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY,
VADAKARA - 671 101.**

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SMT.K.A.SANJEETHA

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 08-06-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

Msd.

WP(C).No. 17004 of 2015 (A)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS

EXT.P-1: TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 30.04.2015.

**EXT.P-2: TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT IN W.P(C).NO.16458/2015
DATED 03.06.2015.**

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS

NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.A.TO JUDGE.

Msd.

A.V. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI,J.

W.P.(c) No. 17004 of 2015

Dated this the 08th day of June, 2015

JUDGMENT

The petitioner is seeking a direction from this Court to the respondent to consider and pass orders on Exhibit P1 representation submitted by the petitioner for the revised timings of his stage carriage.

2. The petitioner is the registered owner of a stage carriage vehicle KL – 57 J 2114 covered by regular permit on the route Peruvannamuzhi – Vadakara – Thanikandipalam. The time schedule was initially issued to the petitioner's service years back. It is alleged that subsequent to the allotment of timings to the petitioner, several other services including KSRTC were introduced in the same sector and many permits were surrendered and hence those timings have become vacant. Petitioner intends to make slight changes to the petitioner's service so as to avoid the clash of timings and in public interest. With this intention, he submitted Exhibit P1 representation for revision of timings of his own service by seeking to change of one particular timing of his service from 6.53 p.m. to 6.14 which is a vacant time. For no reasons the Secretary, Regional Transport Authority has not passed any

orders on Exhibit P1, it is alleged.

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 respondent to consider and pass appropriate orders on Exhibit P1 representation within a time frame.

Considering the nature of the submission, this writ petition is disposed of directing the respondent to consider and pass appropriate orders on Exhibit P1 representation after affording the petitioner an opportunity of being heard, within a period of one month 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 respondent at the earliest.

A.V. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI
JUDGE

DMR/–