

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI

FRIDAY, THE 10TH DAY OF JULY 2015/19TH ASHADHA, 1937

WP(C).No. 20833 of 2015 (D)

PETITIONER :

**T.V. VARGHESE
S/O. VARU, THALIYATH HOUSE
KURICHIKKARA POST
THANIKUDAM, THRISSUR.**

BY ADV. SRI.I.DINESH MENON

RESPONDENT(S) :

- 1. THE SECRETARY,
REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY
THRISSUR – 682 001.**
- 2. A. SULIMAN
S/O. ABDUL RAHIMAN
SWATIYIL HOUSE
THEKKINDADU COLONY
ELANAD P.O., THRISSUR – 682 032.**

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

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 10-07-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

Mn

...2/-

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS :

- EXT.P1 : COPY OF THE PERMIT BY VIRTUE OF WHICH THE PETITIONER IS OPERATING SERVICE ON THE ROUTE THIRUVILWAMALA – MAYANNUR-THRISSUR THANIKKUDAM.
- EXT.P2 COPY OF THE TIME SCHEDULE BY VIRTUE OF WHICH THE PETITIONER IS OPERATING SERVICE ON THE ROUTE THIRUVILWAMALA – MAYANNUR-THRISSUR THANIKKUDAM.
- EXT.P3 COPY OF THE AGENDA AS WELL AS THE DECISION OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY THRISSUR AT ITS MEETING HELD ON 7-8-2014.
- EXT.P4 COPY OF THE TIMING CONFERENCE NOTICE.
- EXT.P5 COPY OF THE REQUEST SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE FIRST RESPONDENT TO AVERT THE CLASH OF TIMINGS BETWEEN THE PETITIONER'S SERVICE AS WELL AS THAT OF THE SECOND RESPONDENT'S SERVICE.

RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS : NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.A. TO JUDGE

Mn

A.V. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI, J.

W.P.(C) No. 20833 of 2015

Dated this the 10th day of July, 2015.

JUDGMENT

The petitioner has come up before this court for a direction to the first respondent to consider Ext.P5 request to avert clash of timings between the petitioner's service and that of the second respondent's service.

2. The petitioner is operating a stage carriage between Thiruvilwamala and Mayannur via Thrissur & Thanikkudam. The petitioner alleges that the timings of the second respondent's service was settled without hearing the grievance of the petitioner and resultantly there is acute clash of timings between the petitioner's service and that of the second respondent. Both services are operating neck to neck. The petitioner alleges that he had met the first respondent more than once, seeking redressal of his grievances. However, it did not evoke any positive response. 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 first respondent to consider Ext.P5 request after affording the petitioner and the second respondent, an opportunity of being heard, within a period of two weeks 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 first respondent at the earliest.

A.V. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI
JUDGE

Scl.