

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI

TUESDAY, THE 14TH DAY OF JULY 2015/23RD ASHADHA, 1937

WP(C).No. 21236 of 2015 (D)

PETITIONER(S):

1. GOPI T.K, S/O.KOCHUNNI,AGED 64 YEARS,
THIYYADI HOUSE, AYYANTHOLE,
THRISSUR- 680 003.
2. MOHANADASAN, S/O.VIJAYAN, AGED 52 YEARS,
VAKAYIL VEEDU, NEDUMPUZHA P.O.
3. SANTHOSH V.C, S/O.CHANDRAN,AGED 44 YEARS,
VAKAYI VEEDU, NEDUMPUZHA P.O.
4. NIRMAL PREMAN, S/O.PREMAN, AGED 23 YEARS,
VAKAYIL VEEDU, NEDUMPUZHA P.O.
5. BAIJU K.P.,S/O.PAPACHAN, AGED 43 YEARS,
KOLLANOOR VEEDU, VADOOKARA P.O.
6. GOPI P.N., S/O.NANU,AGED 43 YEARS,
PEECHAMPILLY VEEDU, VADOOKARA P.O.,
THRISSUR.
7. LATHEESH KUMAR V.P.,S/O.PUSHPAKARAN, AGED 38 YEARS,
VADAKEKKARA VEEDU, KURIACHIRA P.O.
8. VINEESH P.V.,S/O.VELAYUDHAN,AGED 39 YEARS,
PAALAKODI VEEDU, VADOOKARA P.O.
9. PRADEEPAN K.K., S/O.KESAVAN,AGED 43 YEARS,
KOOTUNGAL VEEDU, KURIACHIRA P.O.
10. SUJANAN P.P.,S/O.PADMANABHAN, AGED 49 YEARS,
VALIYAPARAMBIL VEEDU, VADOOKARA P.O.
11. RAJU T.B., S/O.BHASKARAN, AGED 49 YEARS,
THARAYIL VEEDU, KOORKANJERI P.O.
12. RASHEED V.K., S/O.ABDULREHIMAN,AGED 60 YEARS,
VALIYAKATH VEEDU, KOORKANJERI P.O.
13. BENNY C.O., AGED 39 YEARS,
CHITTAPILLY HOUSE, NELLIKUNNU.

WP(C).NO.21236/2015

14. SUDHEESH K.S., S/O.SASI, AGED 31 YEARS,
KUNNATH HOUSE, KOORKANJERI P.O.
15. SUJATHA K.C.,W/O.SUKU, AGED 39 YEARS,
VADAKOOT HOUSE, PUTHOORKARA P.O.
16. SREEJI K.K, S/O.KARTHIKEYAN,AGED 42 YEARS,
KODANI VEEDU, NEDUMPUZHA P.O.
17. AJEESH V.S.,S/O.SUBHASH, AGED 33 YEARS,
VAKAYAIL VEDU, NEDUMPUZHA.
18. SUDHAKARAN C.B.,S/O.BALAN, AGED 52 YEARS,
CHERUPUZHA VEEDU, CHETTUPUZHA.

BY ADVS.SRI.E.VIJIN KARTHIK
SRI.BIJU JOSEPH
SRI.SREEJITH S.NAIR

RESPONDENT(S):

1. THE CORPORATION OF THRISSUR,
CORPORATION OFFICE, M.O.ROAD, VELIYANOOR,
THRISSUR, PIN: 680 001.
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
2. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR,
THRISSUR DISTRICT, CIVIL STATION, AYYANTHOLE,
THRISSUR- PIN: 680 003.
3. THE REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY,
CIVIL STATION, AYYANTHOLE, THRISSUR,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, PIN: 680 004.

R1 BY ADVS. SRI.K.P.VIJAYAN
SRI.V.N.HARIDAS
R2 & R3 BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SMT. K.A.SANJEETHA

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 14-07-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:

sts

WP(C).No. 21236 of 2015 (D)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS

- P1: A COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONERS**
- P2: A COPY OF THE ACKNOWLEDGEMENT DATED 10/03/2015 ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT**
- P3: A COPY OF THE ACKNOWLEDGMENT DATED 10/03/2015 ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT**
- P4: A COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DULY ACKNOWLEDGED BY THE 3RD RESPONDENT**

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS: **NIL**

/TRUE COPY/

P.A.TO JUDGE

sts

A.V. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI, J.

W.P.(C) No. 21236 of 2015

Dated this the 14th day of July, 2015

J U D G M E N T

Aggrieved by the lethargy on the part of the respondents in issuing valid permits as compromised at the time of issuing vehicles to the petitioners, they have come up before this Court.

2. The petitioners are unemployed and have attended various programs and classes conducted by the Kudumbasree Mission of the 1st respondent; and as per the self employment scheme, the petitioners were allotted with autorikshaws. The petitioners are residing within the limits of the 1st respondent. When the vehicles were handed over, the petitioners were informed that they would be also issued with city permit for enabling them to ply their autorikshaws within the local limits of the respondent corporation. The petitioners allege that it has been an year since they were allotted with the vehicles. However, till date, the respondents have not granted

..2..

permits to the petitioners. Since they are not having a valid permit, they cannot ply their vehicles inside the city limit and even they are restrained from carrying passengers from other areas towards the city limits; it is alleged. Being aggrieved by the inordinate delay in issuing permits, they submitted Ext.P1 representation to the respondents on 10.03.2015. The same has not been considered so far. Hence, this writ petition.

2. Arguments have been heard.

As the learned counsel for the petitioners confined his argument to the limited prayer for a time bound disposal of Ext.P1 representation now pending before the respondents, the writ petition is disposed of directing respondents 1 to 3 to consider Ext.P1 representation after affording the petitioners an opportunity of being heard, within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment.

Sd/-
A.V. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI
JUDGE

bka/-