

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI

THURSDAY, THE 11TH DAY OF JUNE 2015/21ST JYAISHTA, 1937

WP(C).No. 17389 of 2015 (W)

PETITIONER :

**MUHAMMED KOYA K.P.,
S/O. MUHAMMED, KARAPPOOLA HOUSE
NARUKARA P.O., MANJERI
MALAPPURAM DISTRICT.**

BY ADV. SRI.SAJU J. VALLYARA

RESPONDENT(S) :

- 1. THE REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, MALAPPURAM
PIN – 676 505.**
- 2. THE SECRETARY
REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY
MALAPPURAM, PIN – 676 505.**

R1 & R2 BY GOVT. PLEADER SMT. K.A. SANJEETHA

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 11-06-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

Mn

...2/-

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS :

EXT.P1 : PHOTOCOPY OF THE APPLICATION FOR VARIATION OF PERMIT
SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT ON
22.7.2014.

EXT.P2 PHOTOCOPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE 1ST RESPONDENT
DATED 4.2.2015 VIDE ITEM NO. 30.

EXT.P3 PHOTOCOPY OF THE REQUEST DATED 21.5.2015 ALONG WITH THE
LIST OF STOPS SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE 2ND
RESPONDENT.

RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS : NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.A. TO JUDGE

Mn

A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI, J.

= = = = =

W.P(C) No.17389 of 2015

= = = = =

Dated this the 11th day of June, 2015

JUDGMENT

This writ petition is filed for a direction to the first respondent to consider Ext.P3 request within a reasonable time.

2. The petitioner is conducting a regular stage carriage service on the route Thaliyamkundu-Kozhikode with his stage carriage bearing no.KL-60/3099 as an ordinary service. According to the petitioner, the above route is a long route having a distance of 117.5 kilometres and the operation of service as ordinary service causes much inconvenience and hardship to the direct and long distance passengers. Therefore, he submitted application for conversion of service as LSOS which was considered and rejected by Ext.P2 on the ground that the petitioner has not furnished the limited number of stops for limited stop facility.

3. The petitioner submitted Ext.P3 request along with the list of limited number of stops. However, the respondents are not taking any action on the request. It is with this background, the petitioner has come up before this Court.

4. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Pleader in the matter.

5. Ext.P1 was rejected on account of the fact that the applicant is not entitled to change or limit the number of stops. However, by Ext.P3 request, the petitioner has furnished the number of stops and at present, there is no impediment in considering Ext.P3 *de hors* Ext.P2 order.

Therefore, the writ petition is disposed of directing the respondents to consider and pass orders on Ext.P3 request submitted by the petitioner *de hors* Ext.P2 within a period of three weeks after affording the petitioner an opportunity of being heard.

Sd/-

A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI
JUDGE

krj