

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI

WEDNESDAY, THE 22ND DAY OF JULY 2015/31ST ASHADHA, 1937

WP(C).No. 21182 of 2015 (W)

PETITIONER:

**HABEEB RAHMAN, S/O.ABOOBACKER,
VEEPEES, VALIYAPARAMBIL HOUSE,
PARAPPANANGADI, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT.**

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

RESPONDENT:

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

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

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 22-07-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

rs.

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:-

- P1 TRUE COPY OF THE REGULAR PERMIT RELATING TO BUS NO.KL-11Q-5040.
- P2 TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION DATED 01.07.2015 MADE BEFORE THE RESPONDENT IN FORM NO.PVA UNDER RULE 174 AND 179 OF THE KMV RULES.
- P3 TRUE COPY OF THE RECEIPT ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT FOR RECEIPT OF EXHIBIT. P2 APPLICATION.

RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS:- NIL.

//TRUE COPY//

P.A. TO JUDGE

rs.

A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI, J.

=====

W.P(C) No.21182 of 2015

=====

Dated this the 22nd day of July, 2015

JUDGMENT

The petitioner has requested for an early disposal of Ext.P2 application for replacement.

2. The petitioner is a stage carriage operator and is the registered owner of a bus No.KL-11/Q-5040 which is covered with a regular stage carriage permit to operate on the route between Parappanangadi and Manjeri via Chemmad. Since the above mentioned vehicle was causing frequent break down and the passengers were also making complaints, the petitioner had decided to replace the vehicle with another vehicle which is a 2002 model Ashok Leyland with a seating of 48 seats.

3. Under the above circumstances, the petitioner made an application for replacement of the existing vehicle with vehicle No.KL-09/AG-5271. However, the respondent on receipt of Ext.P2

informed the petitioner that the application cannot be considered and same would be forwarded to the RTA in its next meeting.

4. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Senior Government Pleader.

5. When the matter came up for admission, the learned counsel for the petitioner confined his argument to the limited prayer seeking a direction to the respondent to consider and pass orders on Ext.P2 application submitted by him within a time frame.

Considering the nature of the submission and the relief sought for, this writ petition is disposed of directing the respondent to consider and pass orders on Ext.P2 application submitted by the petitioner within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment

sd/-

A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI
JUDGE

krj