

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.HARILAL

FRIDAY, THE 27TH DAY OF NOVEMBER 2015/6TH AGRAHAYANA, 1937

WP(C).No. 35882 of 2015 (I)

PETITIONER :

**MONESH P.R.,
THOTTUNKALPARAMBIL HOUSE
SREEKANDAMANGALAM P.O.,
ATHIRAMPUZHA, KOTTAYAM.**

BY ADV. SRI.I.DINESH MENON

RESPONDENT :

**THE SECRETARY,
REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY
KOTTAYAM – 686 002.**

BY GOVT. PLEADER SMT. K.A SANJEETHA

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 27-11-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

Mn

...2/-

WP(C).No. 35882 of 2015 (I)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS :

EXT.P1 : COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 9.10.2015.

EXT.P2 COPY OF THE JUDGMENT IN WP(C) NO. 16458/2015 DATED 3.6.2015.

RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS : NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.A. TO JUDGE

Mn

K. HARILAL, J.

= = = = =

W.P. (C) No.35882 of 2015

- - - - -

Dated this the 27th day of November, 2015

J U D G M E N T

The petitioner is the registered owner of a stage carriage vehicle bearing Registration No. KL-5/AL-1208 and he has been granted with a regular permit on the route Maniyaparambu-Kuruppanthara-Kottayam, with a set of timings several years back and he is operating the said service till now, without any change in the existing timings. According to the petitioner, now some of the timings of the said service are in clash with other services on the route in question. In the said circumstances, the petitioner preferred Ext.P1 request, before the respondent, for revision of his own timings, as making into one particular trip between Kottayam and

-: 2 :-

Medical College in the noon timings. Thus, the petitioner requested to consider the proposed timings, on the ground of introduction of other services on the route in question and clash of timings with other services. The grievance of the petitioner is that the respondent has not taken any steps on Ext.P1 application, seeking revision of the timings of his stage carriage so far, despite to the long lapse of time. To substantiate the petitioner's right to get the timings revised, on the basis of subsequent grant of permit to others, the petitioner relied on the decision of this Court in ***Joji Edattel v. The Secretary, RTA, Idukki*** [2004(1)KLT 493].

2. In the light of the above decision, I am of the view that Ext.P1 application, seeking revision of existing timings deserves to be considered and orders be passed, at the earliest.

-: 3 :-

3. Consequently, the respondent is directed to consider and pass orders on Ext.P1, at the earliest, at any rate, within a period of one month, from the date of receipt of the copy of this judgment.

This Writ Petition is disposed of accordingly.

Sd/-
K. HARILAL,
JUDGE

DST

//True copy//

P.A. To Judge