

as allotted to him, he filed a writ petition in this Court being **C. W. P. No. 24839 of 2013 – Sukhdeep Singh vs. Secretary, Regional Transport Authority, Patiala**, seeking framing of a regular time table, which was disposed of vide order dated 23.05.2014, with a direction to the respondent to frame a regular time table after considering the representation moved by the petitioner as well as other parties concerned. The necessary exercise was directed to be done within a period of one month from the date of receipt of the order. When the order was not complied with, the petitioner approached this Court through a Contempt Petition being **COCP No. 3198 of 2014 – Sukhdeep Singh vs. Harmel Singh**, during the pendency whereof, the regular time table was framed.

Through the present petition, the regular time table is challenged. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the regular time table is to the prejudice of the petitioner and the earlier provisional time table should be allowed to continue as no one had ever filed any objection against the same. The petitioner is clearly estopped from raising such a plea as it was the petitioner himself, who had approached this Court earlier through a writ petition and then a contempt petition for framing of a regular time table. Thus, it does not lie in his mouth to now seek revival of the earlier provisional time table.

The other issue raised by the petitioner is that the as a result of the regular time table, there is no bus service left to some of the villages.

After considering the record, the Tribunal has held that no complaint has

been received from any member of the public on that issue and thus, the ground raised by the petitioner was rejected. I have no reason to disagree with the same.

The record of the case further reveals that the regular time table has been made after issuance of notice to all concerned operators and after objections have been invited from all concerned through publication of notice. No other person has challenged the impugned time table except the petitioner. Even the petitioner has not been able to pin-point any factual basis so as to why the regular time table should be set aside.

In view of the above, I have little hesitation in dismissing the writ petition in limine as the same is bereft of any merit.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

November 19, 2015

monika