

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.HARILAL

TUESDAY, THE 1ST DAY OF DECEMBER 2015/10TH AGRAHAYANA, 1937

WP(C).No. 36237 of 2015 (D)

PETITIONER :

**MAJEED N.K.,
S/O. MAMMU, KEEZHANA MEETHAL HOUSE,
P.O. KOYILANDY, KOZHIKODE.**

BY ADV. SRI.I.DINESH MENON

RESPONDENT :

**THE SECRETARY,
REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY
VADAKARA 673 101.**

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

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 01-12-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

Mn

...2/-

WP(C).No. 36237 of 2015 (D)

APPENDIX

PETITIONERS' EXHIBITS :

EXHIBIT P1 TRUE COPY THE REPRESENTATION DT. 30-10-2015.

**EXHIBIT P2 TRUE 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.36237 of 2015

- - - - -

Dated this the 1st day of December, 2015

J U D G M E N T

The petitioner is the registered owner of a stage carriage vehicle bearing Reg. No. KL-56 A 9099 and he has been granted with a regular permit on the route Meppayur - Nelliadikadavu - Kollam - Koyilandy - Kozhikode with a set of timings, which was given several years back and the petitioner is operating the vehicle with that timing till now, without any change in the existing timings. After the issuance of the set of timings, some of the timings of the 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, seeking revision of his own timings. Thus, his only prayer is to consider Ext.P1 and pass orders, so as to remove the clash between the timings of the petitioner's vehicle and that of others. To substantiate his right to get revision of the existing

-: 2 :-

timings, the petitioner relied on the decision of this Court in ***Joji Edattel v. The Secretary, RTA, Idukki*** [2004(1) KLT 493].

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Pleader.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner confines his arguments to the limited prayer to issue a direction to dispose of Exts.P1 application, at the earliest.

4. Having regard to the grievance highlighted in Ext.P1, 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 a copy of this judgment.

This Writ Petition is disposed of accordingly.

Sd/-
K. HARILAL,
JUDGE

DST

//True copy//

P.A. To Judge