YOGESH TIWARI
Digitally signed by YOGESH TIWARI
Date: 2026.11.05 10:31:26 +0530

CGHC010433832026 2026:CGHC:46668

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 5582 of 2026

Shantanu Rai S/o- Shri Prakash Chandra Rai Aged About 24 Years R/o- Ward No. 14, Old Bus Stand, Village- Pendra, Tahsil- Pendra, District - Gaurela-Pendra-Marwahi, C.G.

... Petitioner

versus

Regional Transport Authority Chhattisgarh, O/o- 3rd Floor, Comercial Complex, Sector - 27, Nava Raipur, Distt.- Raipur, (C.G.)

... Respondent

(Cause-title taken from Case Information System)

For Petitioner	:	Ms. Mamta Mahilange, Advocate
For Respondent	:	Dr. Arham Siddiqui, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Amitendra Kishore Prasad
Order On Board

04.11.2026

1. By way of this Petition, the petitioner is seeking a direction to respondent -Regional Transport Authority Chhattisgarh, to consider and decide the petitioner’s application dated 01.09.2026 for grant of Permanent Stage Carriage Permit on the route Pendraroad to Manendragarh via Pendra, Kotmi, Rusga,

Danikundi, Marwahi, Baror, Kansbahra, Ledri and one return trip daily, which according to the petitioner is pending for consideration.

2. Facts of the case are that the petitioner is a bus operator and is operating his vehicle on the strength of permits granted by the State authorities. The petitioner submitted an application dated 01.09.2026 for grant of Permanent Stage Carriage Permit on the aforesaid route. It is stated that despite repeated requests and reminders, the said application has not been decided by the competent authority. It is further submitted that as per Rule 74(4) of the Motor Vehicle Rules, 1994, the competent authority is required to decide such application within 60 days, however, in the present case, the application has remained pending beyond the prescribed period.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the application has been kept pending for an inordinate period without any justification, which is contrary to Rule 74(4) of the Motor Vehicle Rules, 1994. It is further submitted that similarly situated applicants have been granted timely consideration, whereas the petitioner has been deprived of his statutory right to consideration of his application. It is also submitted that non-decision of the application is arbitrary and affects the petitioner’s right to livelihood and business.

4. Learned State counsel submits that the application of the petitioner shall be considered and decided by the competent authority strictly in accordance with law and within a reasonable time, and that there is no deliberate inaction on the part of the authorities.

5. From the perusal of the pleadings and submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties, it transpires that the petitioner has submitted an application for grant of Permanent Stage Carriage Permit which is admittedly pending before the competent authority since 01.09.2026. It is further noticed that Rule 74(4) of the Motor Vehicle Rules, 1994 contemplates consideration and decision of such application within 60 days. However, despite lapse of considerable time, no decision has been taken on the petitioner's application.

6. In view of the admitted factual position and the statement made by learned State counsel, this Court is of the considered opinion that the ends of justice would be met if a direction is issued to the competent authority to decide the petitioner's application within a time-bound period.

7. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is **disposed of** with a direction to respondent-Regional Transport Authority, Chhattisgarh to consider and decide the petitioners' application dated 01.09.2026 for grant of Permanent Stage Carriage Permit on the aforesaid route, strictly in accordance with law, by passing a reasoned and

speaking order, within a period of **30 days** from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

8. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the claim of the petitioner and all issues are left open to be decided by the competent authority in accordance with law.

No order as to costs.

Sd/-

(Amitendra Kishore Prasad)
Judge

Yogesh