

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A. V. SESA SAI**

**WRIT PETITION No.37276 OF 2018**

**ORDER:**

Heard Sri B. Siva Rama Krishnaiah, learned counsel for the petitioner, and learned Government Pleader for Transport appearing for the respondents.

In this Writ Petition the challenge is to Memo No.5103/B2/TS/2018, dated 08.10.2018, issued by the Joint Transport Commissioner and Secretary, State Transport Authority, Hyderabad, the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent herein, rejecting the request of the petitioner for grant of authorization in respect of Tourist Vehicles bearing Nos.KA 01AC 3560 and KA 01AC 3550.

The petitioner submitted two applications for issuance of authorization in respect of Tourist Vehicles bearing Nos.KA 01AC 3560 and KA 01AC 3550 for a period of three months from 01.10.2015 to 31.12.2018 in view of the repairs to the vehicles. It is also the case of the petitioner that it paid the required fee as per the Rules along with the said applications.

The 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent herein by way of the impugned Memo No. 5103/B2/TS/2018, dated 08.10.2018, rejected the request of the petitioner with the following endorsement:

*“As per CMV Rules 83(3), the period of validity of an authorization shall not be exceeding year at a time.”*

While finding fault with the said reason assigned by the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent, it is the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the impugned action is not in conformity with the provisions of Rule 83 (3) of the Central Motor Vehicles Rules, 1989 (for short ‘the Rules’).

On the contrary, it is the submission of the learned Government Pleader for Transport that there is no illegality in the impugned Memo, warranting interference by this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

In order to resolve the controversy, it would be appropriate to refer to the provisions of Rule 83 (3) of the Rules and the said Rule reads as under:

*“The period of validity of an authorization shall not exceed one year at a time.”*

A reading of the above Rule makes it abundantly clear that the authorization can be granted for the period not exceeding one year. It is also evident that there is no minimum period stipulated. The petitioner herein made applications, requesting for grant of authorization only for three months, which obviously does not exceed one year. Therefore, the reason assigned by the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent herein is not in conformity with the Rules.

Accordingly, the Writ Petition is allowed and the impugned Memo No. 5103/B2/TS/2018, dated 08.10.2018, issued by the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent is set aside. Consequently, the respondents herein shall consider the petitioner's application and issue authorization forthwith to him in accordance with Rule 83 (3) of the Rules. There shall be no order as to costs.

The Miscellaneous Petitions, if any, pending in this Writ Petition shall stand closed.

11<sup>th</sup> October, 2018

**Note:**

*Furnish C.C. of the order  
within two days.*

*B/o  
Tsy*

**A. V. SESA SAI, J**

