

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.HARILAL

TUESDAY, THE 8TH DAY OF DECEMBER 2015/17TH AGRAHAYANA, 1937

WP(C).No. 37023 of 2015 (C)

PETITIONER :

**ABDUL NAZER
S/O.MAYINKUTTY,
MULLAPPALLI, PALAZHI
OLAVANNA, G.A.COLLEGE,
KOZHIKODE.**

BY ADV. SRI.G.PRABHAKARAN

RESPONDENT :

**THE SECRETARY
REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY CUM
REGIONAL TRANSPORT OFFICER
KOZHIKODE-673 020.**

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

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 08-12-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

Mn

...2/-

WP(C).No. 37023 of 2015 (C)

APPENDIX

PETITIONERS' EXHIBITS :

**EXT. P1 : TRUE COPY OF THE REQUEST FILED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE
 THE RESPONDENT DT. 9-10-2015 ON THE ROUTE PUNATHIL BAZAR-
 KOZHIKODE-EDAVANNAPPARA-THUVAPPARA, WITH STAGE CARRIAGE
 KL 10/P 4962**

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS : NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.A. TO JUDGE

Mn

K. HARILAL, J.

= = = = =

W.P. (C) No.37023 of 2015

- - - - -

Dated this the 8th day of December, 2015

J U D G M E N T

The petitioner is the registered owner of a stage carriage bearing registration No. KL 10/P 4962 and he has been granted with a regular permit on the route Punathil Bazar - Kozhikode - Edavannappara - Thuvappara with a set of timings, which was given several years back. 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 circumstance, the petitioner preferred Ext.P1 application 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

-: 2 :-

timings of the petitioner's vehicle and that of others. According to the petitioner, the revision of timings is beneficial to the travelling public also. To substantiate his right to get revision of the existing 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. The learned counsel for the petitioner confines his arguments to the limited prayer to issue a direction to dispose of Ext.P1 application at the earliest.

4. Having regard to the grievance highlighted in Ext.P1 application, 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

-: 3 :-

a copy of this judgment.

This writ petition is disposed of accordingly.

Sd/-

**K. HARILAL,
JUDGE**

DST

//True copy//

P.A. To Judge