

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI

MONDAY, THE 10TH DAY OF AUGUST 2015/19TH SRAVANA, 1937

WP(C).No. 23533 of 2015 (N)

PETITIONER:

**REJI VARGHESE, S/O.VARGHESE,
NIRAVATH HOUSE, KUTHUKUZH,
KOTHAMANGALAM.**

BY ADV. SRI.I.DINESH MENON

RESPONDENTS:

- 1. THE SECRETARY,
REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY,
ERNAKULAM -682 030**
- 2. SAJITH T.S.,
THOPPIL HOUSE, NAYATHODE P.O,
ANGAMALY. PIN-683 572**

R1 BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SMT. K.A.SANJEETHA

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 10-08-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

sts

WP(C).No. 23533 of 2015 (N)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS

- P1:- TRUE COPY OF THE PERMIT ON THE ROUTE VADATTUPARA -ANGAMALY MEERANCITY.**
- P2:- TRUE COPY OF THE TIME SCHEDULE ON THE ROUTE VADATTUPARA-ANGAMALY MEERANCITY.**
- P3:- TRUE COPY OF THE REVISED TIMINGS ISSUED TO THE SECOND RESPONDENT'S SERVICE.**
- P4:- TRUE COPY OF THE OBJECTION SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE FIRST RESPONDENT**

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS:

NIL

/TRUE COPY/

P.A.TO JUDGE

sts

A.V. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI, J.

W.P.(C) No. 23533 of 2015

Dated this the 10th day of August, 2015.

JUDGMENT

The petitioner is aggrieved by the non-consideration of Ext.P4 objection for the revision of the second respondent's timings.

2. The petitioner is an existing operator operating with a settled set of timings. The petitioner alleges that he is aggrieved by allotment of one time slot to the second respondent's service and at present both services are operating in acute clash whereby travelling public are put to difficulties. Faced with such a situation, petitioner preferred Ext.P4 request to avert clash of timings between the petitioner as well as that of the second respondent's service as relating to one time slot from Angamalay to Perumbavoor alone. Though the petitioner approached the office of the first respondent on more than one occasion, the request for avoiding the time clash has not been considered till this date;

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 first respondent to consider Ext.P4 objection 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 a copy of this judgment before the first respondent at the earliest.

Sd/-
A.V. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI
JUDGE

Scl.