

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**W.P. (C) No. 2262 of 2017**

M/s. Naveen Transport Partner Jaskirath Singh Bal, aged 23 years, S/o Sardar Harjinder Singh Bal, R/o. Plot No. 8/B, Industrial Area, Dhamdha Road, Durg, Distt. Durg (C.G.)

---- **Petitioner****Versus**

1. M/s. Royal Contract Carrier, C/o. Royal Travels Pandri Bus Stand, Raipur (C.G.)
2. Regional Transport Authority, Raipur Division, Raipur (C.G.)
3. Secretary Regional Transport Authority, Raipur Division, Raipur (C.G.)
4. Sayyed Anwar Ali, C/o. Royal Travels, Pandri, Raipur (C.G.)

---- **Respondents**

For Petitioner	: Mr. Sudeep Johri, Advocate.
For State	: Mr. Gary Mukhopadhyaya, Dy. Govt. Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal**Order On Board****23/08/2017**

Heard.

(1) Respondent No. 4- Sayeed Anwar Ali filed an application for grant of permanent permit under the provision of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 before the Regional Transport Authority, Raipur on the route Durg to Kawardha, which was granted by the Regional Transport Authority, Raipur by order dated 28.5.2016; that was challenged by the petitioner by filing revision No. 18/2016 before the State Transport Appellate Tribunal, Raipur (henceforth "STAT"); The STAT has set aside the order dated 28.5.2016 and remanded the matter to the Regional

Transport Authority for fresh adjudication of the application of respondent No. 4 in accordance with law, against which instant writ petition has been filed questioning the same.

(2) Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the order dated 28.5.2016 has been quashed but the permit issued subsequently has not been quashed.

(3) I have heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and perused the order impugned with utmost circumspection.

(4) The application was filed by respondent No. 4 for granting permanent permit but permit was granted in the name of respondent No. 1 – M/s. Royal Contract Carrier. The Tribunal finding that no such application was made by respondent No. 1, order dated 28.05.2016 passed by the Regional Transport Authority was set aside and the matter was remanded back to the State Transport Authority for hearing and disposal in accordance with law. The substantive order granting permit in favour of respondent No. 1 has already been quashed, I do not find any illegality in the order impugned warranting interference by this Court in the instant writ petition.

(5) Accordingly, the writ petition fails and is hereby dismissed.

Sd/-

(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge

D/-

