

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.HARILAL

FRIDAY, THE 4TH DAY OF DECEMBER 2015/13TH AGRAHAYANA, 1937

WP(C).No. 36708 of 2015 (K)

PETITIONER :

**AJOY L.S., AGED 49 YEARS,
LAKSHMI SADANAM, LAKASSERI, CHENGANNUR.P.O.**

BY ADV. SRI.G.PRABHAKARAN

RESPONDENT :

**THE SECRETARY
REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY CUM
REGIONAL TRANSPORT OFFICER,
PATHANAMTHITTA - 689 649.**

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SMT. SANJEETHA KA

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 04-12-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

bp

WP(C).No. 36708 of 2015 (K)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS

**P1:- TRUE COPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE RTA PATHANAMTHITTA WITH ITS
NO.C3/19062/2015/PTA DATED 24.7.2015.**

**P2:- TRUE COPY OF THE MEMORANDUM OF APPEAL WITHOUT EXHIBIT IN MVAA
NO.227/2015 DATED 12.10.2015.**

**P3:- TRUE COPY OF THE STAY PETITION ALONG WITH AFFIDAVIT
DATED 12.10.2015.**

P4:- TRUE COPY OF THE TIME HEARING NOTICE.

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS : NIL.

//TRUE COPY//

P.A.TO JUDGE

bp

K.HARILAL, J.

W.P.(C) No.36708 of 2015

Dated this the 4th day of December, 2015.

JUDGMENT

The challenge under this writ petition is against Ext.P1 order passed by the respondent.

2. The learned Government Pleader, on instruction, submits that Ext.P1 is challenged before the Appellate Authority, which is evidenced by Exts.P2 and P3.

3. Having regard to the fact that the petitioner had already availed of the statutory remedies provided under the Motor Vehicles Act, I find that there is no extraordinary circumstance warranting interference under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. However, the petitioner is allowed to raise all the contentions in the pending appeal. In the above view, this writ petition will stand dismissed.

Sd/-
K. HARILAL, JUDGE

okb.