

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.HARILAL

THURSDAY, THE 10TH DAY OF DECEMBER 2015/19TH AGRAHAYANA, 1937

WP(C).No. 37421 of 2015 (C)

PETITIONER(S):

1. **ABDUL KHADER, CHALATH HOUSE,
THIRUVANGOOR, KOZHIKODE,
(WITH STAGE CARRIAGE KL.56/B.8089).**
2. **SANTHOSH, PADANNAYIL HOUSE,
ELATHUR, KOZHIKODE
(WITH STAGE CARRIAGE KL.56.D.2799).**

BY ADV. SRI.G.PRABHAKARAN

RESPONDENT(S):

**THE SECRETARY,
REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY
CUM REGIONAL TRANSPORT OFFICER,
VADAKARA-673010.**

BY SENIOR GOVERNMENT PLEADER SMT.SANJEETHA.K.A.

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 10-12-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

PJ

WP(C).No. 37421 of 2015 (C)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS

- P1- TRUE COPY OF THE 1ST PETITIONER'S TIMING DATED 23/6/10**
- P2- TRUE COPY OF THE 2ND PETITIONER'S TIMING DATED 7/1/15**
- P3- TRUE COPY OF THE COMBINED REQUEST FILED BY THE PETITIONERS
BEFORE THE RESPONDENT DATED 24/10/15**
- P4- TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 20/11/15 IN WPC.35061/15.**

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS

NIL.

/ TRUE COPY /

P.S. TO JUDGE

PJ

K. HARILAL, J.

= = = = =

W.P. (C) No.37421 of 2015

- - - - -

Dated this the 10th day of December, 2015

J U D G M E N T

The petitioners 1 and 2 are the registered owners of a stage carriage bearing registration Nos. KL 56/B 8089 and KL 56/D 2799 and they have been granted with a regular permit on the route Mahe palam - Vatakara - Kozhikode touching Chombal Harbour and Thanneerpanthal - Vatakara - Kozhikode respectively 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 petitioners preferred Ext.P3 application before the respondent, seeking revision of his own timings. Thus,

-: 2 :-

their only prayer is to consider Ext.P3 and pass orders, so as to remove the clash between the timings of the petitioners' vehicle and that of others. According to the petitioners, the revision of timings is beneficial to the travelling public also. To substantiate their right to get revision of the existing timings, the petitioners 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 petitioners and the learned Government Pleader.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners confines his arguments to the limited prayer to issue a direction to dispose of Ext.P3 application at the earliest.

4. Having regard to the grievance highlighted in Ext.P3 application, the respondent is directed to consider and pass orders on Ext.P3 at the earliest, at any rate,

-: 3 :-

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