

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CWP No.13740 of 2015
Date of decision: 13.07.2015

Kaur Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

Secretary Regional Transport Authority Ferozpur

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr. P.S. Bawa, Advocate, for the petitioner.

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest?

ARUN PALLI J. (Oral)

A writ in the nature of mandamus is prayed for, so as to direct the respondent to delete permit No.100/Reg/88 covered with bus No.PB-30-A-9527, since expired on 23.11.2011 and permit No.624/Reg/2000 covered with bus No.PB-03-D-7350, since expired on 04.04.2015, from the approved time table and the authorities be directed to reframe afresh time table. The petitioner purports to be a bus operator and claims to have permit No.94/Reg/M/88 to operate on Kandukhera to Killianwali via Bhullar route. Respondent is alleged to be the time table approving authority in the region, which approves the time table as regards the route in question. In short, the grievance being expressed by the petitioner is that though permits No.100/Reg/88 and

624/Reg/2000 had since expired on 23.11.2011 & 04.04.2015, respectively, but are yet included and continue to form part of the time table approved by the approving authority i.e. the respondent. And as a result, the said two vehicles are being plied to date. So much so, petitioner obtained a status report as regards there two permits under Right to Information Act, 2005, and as per the information supplied, Annexure P3, dated 22.06.2015 (Annexure P3), permits No.100/Reg/88 and 624/Reg/2000 have indeed expired in November, 2011 and April, 2015, respectively. That being so, it is maintained that in the wake of the provisions of Section 66 of the Motor Vehicles Act, the said two permits are required to be deleted from the time table. So much so, the respondent was even served upon a legal dated 01.06.2015 (Annexure P2), in this regard. But that too has failed to evoke any response.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that let this petition, at this stage, be disposed of only with a direction to the respondent to consider and decide the legal notice (Annexure P2), served by the petitioner, within a specified time.

That being so, and without expressing any opinion on merit, this petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondent to consider and decide the claim of the petitioner, as set out in his legal notice dated 01.06.2015 (Annexure P2),

strictly in accordance with the law, within a period of two months from the receipt of certified copy of this order. Needless to assert, a comprehensive order shall be passed, assigning reasons in support of the decision arrived at.

July 13, 2015
Rajan

(Arun Palli)
Judge