

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI

TUESDAY, THE 9TH DAY OF JUNE 2015/19TH JYAISHTA, 1937

WP(C).No. 17170 of 2015 (U)

PETITIONER(S) :

DEEPTHI DAMODHARAN,
ASWATHY BHAVAN,
KODANGAPPARA, BATHERY.

BY ADV. SRI.SAJEEV KUMAR K.GOPAL.

RESPONDENT(S) :

1. THE SECRETARY,
REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY,
WAYANAD, PIN: 673 121.
2. KATHAVARAYAN,
ASHWATHY BHAVAN, BEENACHI P.O.,
SULTHAN BATHERY,
PIN: 673 592.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SMT.K.A.SANJEETHA.

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 09-06-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:

rvs.

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S) ' EXHIBITS :

EXT. P1: TRUE COPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE 1ST RESPONDENT DATED
10/7/2014 ISSUING A TIMING FORMULATED FOR TEMPORARY
PERMIT.

EXT. P2: TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER
BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT DATED 17/4/2015.

RESPONDENT(S) ' EXHIBITS :

NIL.

/TRUE COPY/

P.A.TO JUDGE

RVS.

A.V. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI, J.

W.P.(C) No.17170 of 2015

Dated this the 9th day of June, 2015.

JUDGMENT

Aggrieved by the non-consideration of Ext.P2 application by the first respondent, the petitioner has come up before this Court.

2. The petitioner is operating a stage carriage with settled set of timings. The second respondent has been granted a regular permit covering the substantial portion of the petitioner's service. The permit is granted subject to the settlement of timings. The second respondent has not availed the regular permit so far. For the issuance of temporary permit, the first respondent issued a set of timing which is seriously affecting the petitioner's service; it is alleged. The petitioner alleges that she filed Ext.P2 objection pointing out that the clash of timings will have to be avoided and the second respondent can even allot timing taking into consideration the vacant timings also. The timings are not so far settled for regular permit and the second respondent is continuing the service by virtue of temporary permit which causes inconvenience and hardship to the petitioner. The first respondent

has to convene the timing conference and settle the timing for the regular permit taking into consideration the vacant timings available also so that the clash of timings on the above said route can be avoided. Though the petitioner filed Ext.P2, the same has not been considered so far. This is the background of the case.

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

Considering the nature of submissions and the nature of relief sought for, the writ petition is disposed of directing the first respondent to convene a timing conference within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment, for settling the timings of the second respondent and to issue a regular permit on the basis of the decision taken in the timing conference. Nevertheless to say, both sides shall be heard in the said exercise.

Sd/-
A.V. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI
JUDGE

W.P.(C) No.17170 of 2015

-3-

Scl.