

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI

THURSDAY, THE 2ND DAY OF JULY 2015/11TH ASHADHA, 1937

WP(C).No. 19892 of 2015 (J)

PETITIONER(S) :

**RAVEENDRAN,
S/O.KUMARAN, KOZHIKOLLIPARAMBIL HOUSE, THUYIAM,
EDAPPAL, MALAPPURAM.**

BY ADV. SRI.I.DINESH MENON

RESPONDENT(S) :

- 1. THE SECRETARY,
REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY,
MALAPPURAM -676 505.**
- 2. MOOSA,
S/O.MUHAMMED, THACHARAKUNNATH HOUSE, THRITHALA P.O.,
PALAKKAD - 679 534.**

R1 BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SMT.K.A.SANJEETAH

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 02-07-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

Msd.

WP(C).No. 19892 of 2015 (J)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS

EXT.P-1: TRUE COPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS DATED 06.12.2013.

EXT.P-2: TRUE COPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS DATED 25.02.2014.

EXT.P-3: TRUE COPY OF THE REQUEST SUBMITTED ON 15.06.2015.

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS :

NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.A.TO JUDGE.

Msd.

A.V. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI, J.

W.P.(C) No. 19892 of 2015

Dated this the 2nd day of July, 2015.

JUDGMENT

The petitioner is aggrieved by the non-consideration of the request for the revision of timings.

2. The petitioner is the registered owner of a stage carriage vehicle KL-10 Y 6304 covered by regular permit on the route between Puduponnani and Kuttippuram. The petitioner alleges that he is operating on the basis of a settled set of timings. As per Ext.P1 time schedule petitioner has been given passing time at Edappal at 5.06. The petitioner alleges that the second respondent's service is also arriving at Edappal Chungam at 5.05 and there is direct clash between petitioner's service as well as that of the second respondent's service. Petitioner preferred objection against the said time slot. The non-consideration of the objections raised by the petitioner against the allotment of time slot of the second respondent's service is totally untenable and unsustainable

especially when Ext.P2 itself procured for preferring such objection; it is alleged. 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 Government Pleader in the matter.

Considering the nature of the submissions and the nature of the relief sought for, the writ petition is disposed of directing the respondents to consider and pass appropriate orders on Ext.P3 request, after affording the petitioner and the second respondent, 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, it shall be open to the petitioner to produce a copy of the writ petition as well as the copy of this judgment before the respondents at the earliest.

Sd/-
A.V. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI
JUDGE

Scl.