

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI

FRIDAY, THE 19TH DAY OF JUNE 2015/29TH JYAISHTA, 1937

WP(C).No. 18378 of 2015 (V)

PETITIONER :

1. JIBI,
ATTOKKARAN HOUSE
KOTTAMAM, NEELESWARAM
KALADY.
2. SIBI SEBASTIAN
ERATTIL HOUSE, MANJAPRA.
3. V.V. BABY
VADAKKA, ANAPPARA P.O.

BY ADV. SRI.K.V.GOPINATHAN NAIR

RESPONDENT(S) :

1. THE SECRETARY,
REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY,
MUVATTUPUZHA, PIN – 686 661.
2. M.B. AJITHKUMAR
MANGALATH HOUSE
MAYALATTOOR P.O., THOTTUVA
PIN – 683 587.

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

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 19-06-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

Mn

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS :

**EXT.P1 : COPY OF THE TIMING SUGGESTED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT
ALONG WITH THE REGULAR PERMIT APPLICATION.**

**EXT.P2 COPY OF THE OBJECTION FILED BY THE PETITIONERS BEFORE THE
1ST RESPONDENT DATED 11.6.2015.**

RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS : NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.A. TO JUDGE

Mn

A.V. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI, J.

W.P.(C) No. 18378 of 2015

Dated this the 19th day of June, 2015.

JUDGMENT

Petitioners allege that Ext.P2 objection submitted by them regarding the timing in respect of a new service is now pending before the first respondent.

2. Petitioners are operating their service on the strength of valid permits issued by the 1st respondent. It is alleged that they are conducting service with settled set of timings. The second respondent submitted application for regular permit which was considered by the Regional Transport Authority, Muvattupuzha in its meeting held on 26.5.2015. Petitioners further allege that they are objectors before the Regional Transport Authority specifically pointing out the clash of timings and therefore the permit in favour of the second respondent has not been granted. The petitioner alleges that, in the meantime, it is seen that that the second respondent filed an application for temporary permit and sought direction

from this Court for consideration and grant of the permit. The permit is not issued so far and knowing about the same, petitioners filed Ext.P2 objection requesting that the timing in respect of the new service be settled before the issue of permit to the second respondent. It is with this background, the petitioners have come up before this Court.

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

As it was submitted that the next timing conference is scheduled to be held on 24.6.2015, the writ petition is disposed of directing the first respondent to consider Ext.P2 objection in the timing conference scheduled to be held on 24.6.2015, after affording petitioners and the affected parties an opportunity of being heard.

Sd/-
A.V. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI
JUDGE

Scl.