

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI

WEDNESDAY, THE 24TH DAY OF JUNE 2015/3RD ASHADHA, 1937

WP(C).No. 18966 of 2015 (U)

PETITIONER(S) :

**MOOTTAPARAMBAN FAISAL,
S/O.MOHAMMED, MOOTTAPARAMBAN HOUSE, THENNALA P.O.,
VALAKKULAM, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT.**

**BY ADVS.SRI.G.HARIHARAN
SRI.PRAVEEN.H.**

RESPONDENT(S) :

**THE SECRETARY,
REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY,
MALAPPURAM-676 505.**

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SMT.K.A.SANJEETHA

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 24-06-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

Msd.

WP(C).No. 18966 of 2015 (U)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS

**EXHIBIT P1 : TRUE COPY OF STAGE CARRIAGE PERMIT RELATING BY
BUS NO.KL-10N- 7361 WHICH IS VALID UPTO 31.03.2020.**

**EXHIBIT P2 : TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION DATED 02.06.2015 SUBMITTED
BY THE PETITIONER FOR REVISION OF HIS OWN TIMINGS
RELATING TO BUS NO.KL-10/N 7361.**

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS :

NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.S.TO JUDGE.

Msd.

A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI, J

WPC No.18966 of 2015

Dated this the 24th day of June, 2015

JUDGMENT

The petitioner is seeking a direction from this Court to the respondent for the consideration of Ext.P2 request filed by the petitioner for his own revision of timings.

2. The petitioner is a stage carriage operator bearing Reg.No.KL-1/N 7361 which is covered with a regular permit on the route between Venniyur-Chemmad-Tanur-Tirur via Athani, Cherumukku, Thirurangadi, Kodinhi, Pandimuttam, Kannamthali, Tanalur, Payyanangadi, Vylathur, Parapparpurm and Theyyala as ordinary service which is valid up to 31.3.2020. The timings allotted to the petitioner vide Ext.P1 permit have been unsettled due to the introduction of a number of services on the route in

question and the petitioner has been seriously prejudiced on account of that. The petitioner had made a request dated 2.6.2015 requesting to revise the entire departure timings of the existing service with the proposed timings attached along with the said application. However, the respondent is reluctant to consider Ext.P2 stating that the same would be taken up only after a gap of three months. It is with this background, the petitioner has come up before this Court.

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

Having regard to the nature of the submission made, this writ petition is disposed of directing the respondent to consider and pass orders on Ext.P2 request at the earliest, at any rate, within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment.

To facilitate an early action, it shall be open to

the petitioner to produce a copy of the writ petition
and a copy of this judgment before the respondent.

sd/- A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI
JUDGE

CSS/

true copy

P.S.TO JUDGE