

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.HARILAL

FRIDAY, THE 11TH DAY OF DECEMBER 2015/20TH AGRAHAYANA, 1937

WP(C).No. 37692 of 2015 (J)

PETITIONER(S):

**NAGESH, PALLIYIL HOUSE,
ULAVYPU, CHERTHALA, ALAPPUZHA.**

BY ADV. SRI.G.PRABHAKARAN

RESPONDENT(S):

**THE SECRETARY, REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY CUM
REGIONAL TRANSPORT OFFICER, ALAPPUZHA - 688 001.**

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

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
11-12-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:**

AVS

WP(C).No. 37692 of 2015 (J)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS:

**EXHIBITP1: TRUE COPY OF THE OBJECTION FILED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE
THE RESPONDENT DATED 17/11/2015 ON THE ROUTE CHERTHALA -
VYTTILA WITH STAGE CARRIAGE KL 6/F 5817.**

**EXHIBITP2: TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 02/11/2015 IN
WPC.NO.33247/2015**

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS:

NIL

// TRUE COPY//

P.A TO JUDGE

AVS

K. HARILAL, J.

=====

W.P.(C).No.37692 of 2015

=====

Dated this, the 11th 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-6/F 5817 and he has been granted with a regular permit on the route Cherthala-Vyttila via Ottapunna, 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 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 a copy of this judgment.

This writ petition is disposed of accordingly.

**Sd/-
K.HARILAL, JUDGE.**

AVS

The following observation occurring in the 3rd

sentence of paragraph 1 of the judgment dated 11/12/2015 in W.P.(C) No.37692/2015 is deleted as per order dated 13/01/2016 in R.P.19/2016 in W.P.(C) No.37692/2015J.

“In the said circumstance, the petitioner preferred Ext.P1 application before the respondent, seeking revision of his own timings.”

Sd/-
Registrar (Judicial)