

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 13.11.2017

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAVICHANDRABAABU

Writ Petition No.28848 of 2017
and
WMP.No.31065 of 2017

A.Chandru

.. Petitioner

Vs.

The Regional Transport Officer
(North Range)
Ayanavaram,
Chennai-600 023.

.. Respondent

PRAYER:

Writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records pertaining to the impugned order dated 15.09.2017 passed by the respondent in Se Muu No.E2/53821/17 and quash the same and directing the respondent to renew permit of the petitioner's auto rickshaw bearing TN 03 Q 9004.

For Petitioner: Mr.M.Sarfudeen Ali Ahamed

For Respondent : Mr.P.V.Selvakumar

Additional Government Pleader

O R D E R

Mr.P.V.Selvakumar, learned Additional Government Pleader takes notice for the respondent. By consent of the parties, the main writ petition is taken up for final disposal at the admission stage itself.

2. The petitioner is aggrieved against the order of the respondent rejecting the renewal application filed by the petitioner seeking for renewal of the auto rickshaw permit, on the ground that the same was filed belatedly.

3. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondent.

4. It is not in dispute that the writ petitioner was originally granted auto rickshaw permit and that he made application for renewal of such permit. The only objection raised by the respondent is that the application was filed after the expiry of the time stipulated under the statute for making such application. In other words, it is the contention of the respondent that such application should have been made 15 days prior to the expiry of the original permit. No doubt, the petitioner has filed his application for renewal after the expiry of such period. But at the same time, the case of the petitioner is that he was out of station, due to certain family circumstances at the relevant point of time and therefore, he was not in a position to make his application within the time.

5. The respondent, while admitting the fact that the reason stated for belated filing was due to certain family circumstances, he was out of station, has not stated any reason as to how the respondent is not convinced with such reason. However, the impugned order came to be passed only by stating that the application was filed belatedly.

6. Needless to say that when the respondent is having power to condone the delay, the respondent is not justified in passing the order impugned in this writ petition, mechanically stating that the same is filed belatedly. I find every justification to accept the reasons for condonation.

7. The learned counsel for the petitioner also relied on a decision of this Court made in W.P.No.26035 of 2017 dated 05.10.2017, passed under similar circumstances wherein this Court, after condonation of delay, has directed the authority to consider the renewal application on merits.

8 . Accordingly, this writ petition is allowed and the impugned order is set aside. The matter is remitted back to the respondent for considering the application filed by the petitioner seeking for renewal of the auto rickshaw permit and dispose of the same in accordance with the provisions of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988. Such exercise shall be done by the respondent within a period of three weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS IV)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

mk


To

The Regional Transport Officer
(North Range)
Ayanavaram, Chennai-600 023.

+1 cc to M/s.Sarfudeeen Ali Ahamed Advocate sr 80793
+1 cc to the Govt Pleader sr 80512

W.P.No.28848 of 2017

aa24/11/2017



WEB COPY