

Minutes of Regional Transport Authority, Kottayam held on 29.11.2022

Present:-

- 1. Smt. Dr. P K Jayasree IAS, District Collector and Chairperson RTA**
- 2. Sri. Shaji Madhavan, Deputy Transport Commissioner (CZ-II) and Member, RTA**

I. Fresh Stage Carriage Permits

Item No.1

Heard the learned counsel appeared for the applicant, the representatives of the STU and the objectors.

This is to re-consider the application for fresh S/C permit to operate on the route **Vazhithala Santhigiri College-Nagampadom BS Kottayam** via Kurinji, Ramapuram, Veliyanoor, Uzhavoor, Marangattupalli , Kadaplamattom, Koodalloor, Kidangoor, Ayarkunnam, Manarcadu Kavala, Moscow, Ponpally, Kalathilpady, Kanjikuzhy, Plantation, Collectorate Jn, Logos, Kurian Uthuppu Road as **Ordinary** Service.

This application was considered by this authority in its sitting held on 29.11.2021 vide Item No.11 and being an inter-district fresh stage carriage permit, the decision on the application was adjourned for want of concurrence from Sister RTA Idukki.

In response to the decision of this authority , Sister RTA, Idukki granted concurrence in its sitting held on 04.06.2022 vide Item No.70.

We have examined the application; report and connected files in detail; all objections raised in the open hearing of this authority were also considered.

As per the report of the enquiry officer this is an inter-district route with a route length of 65.5 kms. There is an overlapping of 2.7 kms in the notified routes. As per the existing norms of notification, maximum overlapping distance permissible is 5% of the total route length. In this case , as per the report of the enquiry officer the total overlapping distance is within the permissible limit.

Major objections were with respect to narrow width of the bridge between Ponpally and Moscow and existence of virgin portion there. The same was examined through enquiry officer and the officer has reported that the portion in question is served by a Stage carriage and that the bridge has sufficient width for stage carriage service.

No other legal impediments were observed in this application and thus fresh regular stage carriage permit on the proposed route is **granted** to S/C KL-67-C-4973 or a suitable stage carriage subject to the settlement of timings. The grantee of the permit is directed to produce the current records of a stage carriage for endorsing the granted permit within thirty days of communication of this decision as per Rule 159(2) of KMV Rules, failing which the grant of this regular permit will be treated as revoked without further notice.

Item No.2

Heard the learned counsel appeared for the applicant, the representatives of the STU and the objectors.

This is to consider the application for fresh S/C permit to operate on the route **Veliyanoor-Kanjirappally via** Areekara, Uzhavoor, Kurichithanam, Marangattupally, Vallichira, Pala Kottaramattom BS, Municipal Stadium, Maharani Kavala, Edappadi, Bharananganam, Panackapalam, Erattupetta, Aruvithura Palli Jn., Thidanadu, Pinnackanad, Kalaketty, Kappadu and Anakkallu as **Ordinary** Service.

This is an application for a fresh regular stage carriage permit on the above intra-district route. An enquiry on the application was conducted through the Motor Vehicles Inspector, Joint RTO Pala. As per the report this is an intra-district route with a route length of 50.3 kms and there is an overlapping of 2.2 kms in the notified routes.

We have examined the application; report and connected files in detail; all objections raised in the open hearing of this authority were also considered.

On objectively examining the present scenario on the route portion between Pala-Erattupetta and Erattupetta-Kanjirappally it is revealed that the route portion between Pala-Erattupetta is well served by both STU and private operators and there is no dearth of stage carriage services in the sector. The route portion between Erattupetta-Kanjirappally is very notorious for clash of timings between operators. Even the conduct of timing conference will not be normally possible, since the time gaps are almost negligible.

This authority is of the view that it must be more cautious while dealing with the application for grant of fresh regular permit in an already saturated sector. Choking an already saturated sector with further stage carriage services unmindful of the detrimental effects that it may cause to the public safety is against the interests of promoting an efficient public transport system.

Hence we are of the common view that granting a fresh permit on the proposed route Veliyanoor-Kanjirappally cannot be entertained on the above mentioned reasons.

Therefore the application for fresh stage carriage permit is **rejected**.

Item No.3

Heard the learned counsel appeared for the applicant, representative of the STU and objectors.

This is an application filed for grant of fresh regular stage carriage permit on the route **CHERTHALA-KURUPPANTHARA** via Varanad, Thaneermukkom, Bund road, Edayazham, Kallara and Manvettom as **Ordinary service**.

This authority considered the application and verified the connected files in detail.

A detailed enquiry was conducted through the Motor Vehicles Inspector, Joint RTO Vaikom. As per the report of the enquiry officer this is an **inter-district** route with total route length of 29.7 kms, out of which 9.6 kms lies in Alappuzha district and 20.1 kms lies in the jurisdiction of this authority. There is an overlapping of 1 km in the notified sector and concurrence of the sister RTA is necessary for proceeding with the application.

The Secretary RTA is directed to seek prior concurrence from sister RTA Alappuzha for further consideration of the application.

Hence the application is **adjourned**.

Item No.4

Heard the learned counsel appeared for the applicant, the representatives of the STU and the objectors.

This is to consider the application for fresh S/C permit to operate on the route **VAIKOM-PALA** via Thalayazham, Edayazham, Kallara, Puthenpally, Kuruppanthara, Kuravilangad, Kottaramattom Bus Stand, Mini Civil Station and Old Stand as **Ordinary** Service.

This is an application for a fresh regular stage carriage permit on the above intra-district route, An enquiry on the application was conducted through the Motor Vehicles Inspector, Joint RTO Vaikom. As per the report this is an intra-district route with a route length of 55.2 kms and there is an overlapping of 2.7 kms in the notified routes. As per the existing norms of notification, maximum overlapping distance permissible is 5% of the total route length. In this case, as per the report of the enquiry officer the total overlapping distance is 2.7 kms i.e 4.89 % of the total route length which is in the brim of the total permissible limit.

We have examined the application; report and connected files in detail; all objections raised in the open hearing of this authority were also considered.

The objectors and the representatives of the STU vehemently objected to the findings of the enquiry officer regarding the distance of overlapping and pointed out that there is marked difference in the distance of overlapping from the previous reports. The representatives of STU also called for conducting a joint inspection before proceeding with the application.

We are of also of the opinion that there needs to be more clarity on the above aspects.

In the light of findings of the route enquiry officer and objections received, we are of the common opinion that the objections are sustainable. Hence a re-enquiry is essential to take a right approach on this application.

Thus the Secretary RTA shall,

- a) take steps to conduct a joint inspection of the route through Joint RTO, Vaikom along with the representatives of the STU and after giving due notice to objectors/affected parties.
- b) after conducting the inspection call for a specific report from the Motor Vehicles Inspector, Joint RTO Vaikom regarding the exact distance of overlapping in the notified sector.
- c) place the application before this authority with reports and findings of re-enquiry.

Hence, the decision on this application for grant of fresh stage carriage permit is ***adjourned***.

Item No.5

Heard the learned counsel appeared for the applicant, the representatives of the STU and the objectors.

This is to consider the application for fresh S/C permit to operate on the route **VAIKOM-PALA** via Thalayazham, Edayazham, Kallara, Puthenpally, Kuruppanthara, Kuravilangad, Kottaramattom Bus Stand, Mini Civil Station and Old Stand as **Ordinary** Service.

This is an application for a fresh regular stage carriage permit on the above intra-district route, An enquiry on the application was conducted through the Motor Vehicles Inspector, Joint RTO Vaikom. As per the report this is an intra-

district route with a route length of 55.2 kms and there is an overlapping of 2.7 kms in the notified routes. As per the existing norms of notification, maximum overlapping distance permissible is 5% of the total route length. In this case, as per the report of the enquiry officer the total overlapping distance is 2.7 kms i.e 4.89 % of the total route length which is in the brim of the total permissible limit.

We have examined the application; report and connected files in detail; all objections raised in the open hearing of this authority were also considered.

The objectors and the representatives of the STU vehemently objected to the findings of the enquiry officer regarding the distance of overlapping and pointed out that there is marked difference in the distance of overlapping from the previous reports. The representatives of STU also called for conducting a joint inspection before proceeding with the application.

We are of also of the opinion that there needs to be more clarity on the above aspects.

In the light of findings of the route enquiry officer and objections received, we are of the common opinion that the objections are sustainable. Hence a re-enquiry is essential to take a right approach on this application.

Thus the Secretary RTA shall,

a) take steps to conduct a joint inspection of the route through Joint RTO, Vaikom along with the representatives of the STU and after giving due notice to objectors/affected parties.

b) after conducting the inspection call for a specific report from the Motor Vehicles Inspector, Joint RTO Vaikom regarding the exact distance of overlapping in the notified sector.

c) place the application before this authority with reports and findings of re-enquiry.

Hence, the decision on this application for grant of fresh stage carriage permit is ***adjourned***.

Item No.6

Heard the learned counsel appeared for the applicant, the representatives of the STU and the objectors.

This is to consider the application for fresh S/C permit to operate on the route **VAIKOM-PALA via Thalayazham, Edayazham, Kallara, Puthenpally, Kuruppanthara, Kuravilangad, Kottaramattom Bus Stand, Mini Civil Station and Old Stand as Ordinary Service.**

This is an application for a fresh regular stage carriage permit on the above intra-district route, An enquiry on the application was conducted through the Motor Vehicles Inspector, Joint RTO Vaikom. As per the report this is an intra-district route with a route length of 55.2 kms and there is an overlapping of 2.7 kms in the notified routes. As per the existing norms of notification, maximum overlapping distance permissible is 5% of the total route length. In this case, as per the report of the enquiry officer the total overlapping distance is 2.7 kms i.e 4.89 % of the total route length which is in the brim of the total permissible limit.

We have examined the application; report and connected files in detail; all objections raised in the open hearing of this authority were also considered.

The objectors and the representatives of the STU vehemently objected to the findings of the enquiry officer regarding the distance of overlapping and pointed

out that there is marked difference in the distance of overlapping from the previous reports. The representatives of STU also called for conducting a joint inspection before proceeding with the application.

We are of also of the opinion that there needs to be more clarity on the above aspects.

In the light of findings of the route enquiry officer and objections received, we are of the common opinion that the objections are sustainable. Hence a re-enquiry is essential to take a right approach on this application.

Thus the Secretary RTA shall,

- a) take steps to conduct a joint inspection of the route through Joint RTO, Vaikom along with the representatives of the STU and after giving due notice to objectors/affected parties.
- b) after conducting the inspection call for a specific report from the Motor Vehicles Inspector, Joint RTO Vaikom regarding the exact distance of overlapping in the notified sector.
- c) place the application before this authority with reports and findings of re-enquiry.

Hence, the decision on this application for grant of fresh stage carriage permit is ***adjourned***.

Item No.7

Heard the learned counsel appeared for the applicant, the representatives of the STU and the objectors.

This is to consider the application for fresh S/C permit to operate on the route **VAIKOM-PALA via Thalayazham, Edayazham, Kallara, Puthenpally, Kuruppanthara, Kuravilangad, Kottaramattom Bus Stand, Mini Civil Station and Old Stand** as **Ordinary** Service.

This is an application for a fresh regular stage carriage permit on the above intra-district route, An enquiry on the application was conducted through the Motor Vehicles Inspector, Joint RTO Vaikom. As per the report this is an intra-district route with a route length of 55.2 kms and there is an overlapping of 2.7 kms in the notified routes. As per the existing norms of notification, maximum overlapping distance permissible is 5% of the total route length. In this case ,as per the report of the enquiry officer the total overlapping distance is 2.7 kms i.e 4.89 % of the total route length which is in the brim of the total permissible limit.

We have examined the application;report and connected files in detail; all objections raised in the open hearing of this authority were also considered.

The objectors and the representatives of the STU vehemently objected to the findings of the enquiry officer regarding the distance of overlapping and pointed out that there is marked difference in the distance of overlapping from the previous reports. The representatives of STU also called for conducting a joint inspection before proceeding with the application.

We are of also of the opinion that there needs to be more clarity on the above aspects.

In the light of findings of the route enquiry officer and objections received, we are of the common opinion that the objections are sustainable. Hence a re-enquiry is essential to take a right approach on this application.

Thus the Secretary RTA shall,

a) take steps to conduct a joint inspection of the route through Joint RTO, Vaikom along with the representatives of the STU and after giving due notice to objectors/affected parties.

b) after conducting the inspection call for a specific report from the Motor Vehicles Inspector, Joint RTO Vaikom regarding the exact distance of overlapping in the notified sector.

c) place the application before this authority with reports and findings of re-enquiry.

Hence, the decision on this application for grant of fresh stage carriage permit is **adjourned**.

Item No.8

Heard the learned counsel appeared for the applicant, the representatives of the STU and the objectors.

This is to consider the application for fresh S/C permit to operate on the route **T V PURAM-KAIPUZHAMUTTU** via Vaikathupalli, Vaikom Dalavakulam Bus stand, Thottakam, Thalayazham, Edayazham, Bund Road, Achinakam, Ambika Market as **Ordinary** Service.

This is an application for a fresh regular stage carriage permit on the above intra-district route.

An enquiry on the application was conducted through the Motor Vehicles Inspector, Joint RTO Vaikom. As per the report this is an intra-district route with a route length of 23.9 kms and there is an overlapping of 500 meters in the notified routes. As per the existing norms of notification, maximum overlapping distance permissible is 5% of the total route length. In this case, as per the report of the enquiry officer the total overlapping distance is 500 meters i.e 2.09 % of the total route length which is within permissible limit.

This authority considered the application and verified the connected records and report of the enquiry officer in detail. We have also considered the objections in the open hearing of this authority.

No other legal impediments were observed in this application and thus fresh regular stage carriage permit on the proposed route is **granted** to S/C KL 11 X 6525 or a suitable stage carriage subject to the settlement of timings. The grantee of the permit is directed to produce the current records of a stage carriage for endorsing the granted permit within thirty days of communication of this decision as per Rule 159(2) of KMV Rules, failing which the grant of this regular permit will be treated as revoked without further notice.

Item No.9

Heard the learned counsel appeared for the applicant, the representatives of the STU and the objectors.

This is to consider the application for fresh S/C permit to operate on the route **PAIPPAD MARKET-PERUNNA BS CHANGANASSERY** via Paippad, Nalukodi and Mukkattupadi as **Ordinary** Service.

This is an application for a fresh regular stage carriage permit on the above intra-district route.

An enquiry on the application was conducted through the Motor Vehicles Inspector, Joint RTO Changanassery. As per the report this is an intra-district

route with a route length of 7.7 kms and there is an overlapping of 500 meters in the notified routes. As per the existing norms of notification, maximum overlapping distance permissible is 5% of the total route length. In this case, as per the report of the enquiry officer the total overlapping distance is 200 meters i.e 2.59 % of the total route length which is within permissible limit.

This authority considered the application and verified the connected records and report of the enquiry officer in detail. We have also considered the objections in the open hearing of this authority.

The starting and halting termini proposed by the applicant is Paippad Market. In the open hearing of this authority the objectors pointed out that there is not enough space to turn or park a stage carriage at Paippad Market which leads to traffic congestion.

On perusal of the objection we are of the common opinion that the objections are sustainable.

Thus the Secretary RTA will

a) re-enquire the matter through the Motor Vehicles Inspector, Joint RTO Changanassery as to whether there is sufficient space for parking and turning around for stage carriages at Paippad Market and also submit a specific report regarding the density of stage carriages in the proposed route since the route involves an urban area and the effect it has on the current traffic situation.

b) Place the application with the re-enquiry reports before this authority.

Hence, the decision on this application is **adjourned**.

Item No.10

Heard the learned counsel appeared for the applicant, the representatives of the STU and the objectors.

This is to consider the application for fresh S/C permit to operate on the route **PONKUNNAM-MANIMALA via** Cheruvally Temple and Pazhayidom as **Ordinary** Service.

This is an application for a fresh regular stage carriage permit on the above intra-district route.

Along with the application for grant of fresh regular permit the an application was also submitted for grant of temporary permit U/S 87(1)c of MV Act and also produced judgment of the Hon'ble High Court in WP (C) No.30185 of 2022. An enquiry on the application was conducted through the Motor Vehicles Inspector, Joint RTO Kanjirappally. As per the report this is an intra-district route with a route length of 13 kms and there is an overlapping of 120 meters in the notified routes. As per the existing norms of notification, maximum overlapping distance permissible is 5% of the total route length. In this case, as per the report of the enquiry officer the total overlapping distance is 120 meters i.e 0.92 % of the total route length which is within permissible limit.

This authority considered the application and verified the connected records and report of the enquiry officer, judgment of the Hon'ble Court in detail.

On the application of temporary permit the enquiry officer has reported that there is no urgent necessity of granting the same and there is adequate services on the proposed route.

Regarding the application for grant of fresh regular permit and on verification of records it is noticed that the proposed timings is identical to that of another stage carriage.

We are of the opinion that the proposed timings is not clash free. Therefore the applicant is directed to submit a modified set of timings in par with that required for the existing stage carriage operations and that is clash free on the proposed route for considering the application.

Hence, the decision on this application is ***adjourned.***

Item No.11

Heard the learned counsel appeared for the applicant, the representatives of the STU and the objectors.

This is to consider the application for fresh S/C permit to operate on the route **PALA-PONKUNNAM via Poovarani, Paika, Elikkulam, Koorali and Attickal as Ordinary Service.**

This is an application for a fresh regular stage carriage permit on the above intra-district route.

An enquiry on the application was conducted through the Motor Vehicles Inspector, Joint RTO Kanjirappally. As per the report this is an intra-district route with a route length of 24 kms and there is an overlapping of 2.7 kms in the notified routes. As per the existing norms of notification, maximum overlapping distance permissible is 5% of the total route length. In this case, as per the report of the enquiry officer the total overlapping distance is 790 meters i.e 3.29 % of the total route length.

We have examined the application; report and connected files in detail; all objections raised in the open hearing of this authority were also considered.

The objectors and the representatives of the STU vehemently objected to the findings of the enquiry officer regarding the distance of overlapping and pointed out that there is marked difference in the total distance of the route, distance of overlapping from the previous reports. On examining the application and report of the enquiry officer in detail it is noticed that the report is not specific regarding the distance of overlapping in Pala and Ponkunnam towns. Also the application submitted doesn't mention all en-route intermediate points and there was objection regarding the line of traverse especially at Pala town.

We are of the opinion that there needs to be more clarity on the above aspects.

Hence a re-enquiry is essential to take a right approach on this application.

Thus the Secretary RTA will,

a) direct the applicant to furnish a modified application by mentioning all the en-route intermediate points.

b) call for a detailed re-enquiry report from the Joint Regional Transport Officer, Kanjirappally with detailed sketch of the route and the proposed line of traverse at Pala town specifically mentioning the exact portions and distance of overlapping in the notified routes.

c) place the application before this authority with reports and findings of re-enquiry.

Hence, the decision on this application for grant of fresh stage carriage permit is ***adjourned.***

Item No.12

Heard the learned counsel appeared for the applicant, the representatives of the STU and the objectors.

This is to consider the application for fresh S/C permit to operate on the route **ELAMKADU-MUNDAKAYAM-KUZHIMAVU-PAMPAVALLEY via Yendayar, Koottickal, Mundakayam, Varikkani Junction, Panackachira, Madukka, Koruthodu, Kalaketty and via Kuzhimavu Top, 504 Colony, Punchavayal, Murikkumvayal with two single trips from Mundakayam to Erumely via Karinilam, Pulikunnu and Kannimala as Ordinary Service.**

This is an application for a fresh regular stage carriage permit on the above intra-district route.

Along with the application for fresh regular permit an application for grant of temporary permit U/S 87(1)c of MV Act was also submitted and the applicant also produced a copy of judgments of the Hon'ble High Court in WP(C) No. 31790 of 2022 and WP(C) No. 34076 of 2022.

The judgment directs the Secretary RTA to consider the application of temporary permit and pass appropriate orders within two weeks. Based on the report of the enquiry officer a timing conference was conducted for settling the timings before issuance of temporary permit but the representatives of the STU and other en-route operators strongly objected to the grant of temporary permit citing the pending application for grant of fresh regular permit before the RTA. Due to that temporary permit was not granted.

The application for grant of fresh regular permit was considered within the stipulated time limit set by the Hon'ble Court.

An enquiry on the application was conducted through the Motor Vehicles Inspector, Joint RTO Kanjirappally. As per the report this is an intra-district route with a route length of 67 kms and there is an overlapping of 150 meters in the notified routes. As per the existing norms of notification, maximum overlapping distance permissible is 5% of the total route length. In this case, as per the report of the enquiry officer the total overlapping distance is 150 meters which is within the permissible limit.

We have examined the application, report, connected files, judgments in detail; We have also verified the objections received in the open hearing of this authority. The representatives of STU and en-route operators objected to the proposed timings. The Secretary, RTA will look in to the matter while conducting the timing conference for settlement of timings.

Therefore fresh regular stage carriage permit on the proposed route is **granted** to a suitable stage carriage subject to the settlement of timings.

Following the grant of fresh regular permit the application for temporary permit on the proposed route has become infructuous.

The grantee of the permit is directed to produce the current records of a stage carriage for endorsing the granted permit within thirty days of communication of this decision as per Rule 159(2) of KMV Rules, failing which the grant of this regular permit will be treated as revoked without further notice.

Item No.13

Heard the learned counsel appeared for the applicant, representative of the STU and objectors.

This is an application filed for fresh regular stage carriage permit on the route **CHERUKOLPUZHA-VYTTILA MOBILITY HUB** via Puthezham, Thadiyoor, Theodickal, Vrindavanam, Chalappally, Perumpetty, Chungappara, Kottangal, Manimala, Ponkunnam, Pala Kottaramattom BS, Valavoor, Uzhavoor, Monippally, Ilanji, Piravom, Arakkunnam, Mulanthuruthy, Kandanad, Kureekkad, Puthiyakavu, Kannankulangara, Thripunithura Gandhi Square, Maradu, Kundanoor Jn and Vytilla as **LSOS**.

This authority considered the application and verified the connected files in detail.

A detailed enquiry was conducted through the Motor Vehicles Inspector, Joint RTO Kanjirappally. As per the report of the enquiry officer this is an **inter-district** route with total route length of 129.6 kms, out of which 23.7 kms lies under RTA Pathanamthitta, 17 kms lies under RTA Muvattupuzha, 23.3 kms lies under RTA Ernakulam and 65.6 kms lies in the jurisdiction of this authority. There is an overlapping of 4.120 kms in the notified sector and concurrence of the sister RTA's is necessary for proceeding with the application.

The Secretary RTA is directed to seek prior concurrence from sister RTA's Pathanamthitta, Muvattupuzha and Ernakulam for further consideration of the application.

Hence the decision on this application is **adjourned**.

Item No.14

Heard the learned counsel appeared for the applicant, the representatives of the STU and the objectors.

This is to consider the application for fresh S/C permit to operate on the route **KUZHIMAVU-MUNDAKAYAM** via Kottaramkada, Paschima, Vandanpathal, Varikkani Jn, Mundakayam, Karinilam, Punchavayal, Inchakuzhy, Panackachira, Madukka, Kombukuthy and Koruthodu as **Ordinary** Service.

An enquiry on the application was conducted through the Motor Vehicles Inspector, Joint RTO Kanjirappally. As per the report this is an intra-district route with a route length of 77 kms and there is an overlapping of 70 meters in the notified routes. As per the existing norms of notification, maximum overlapping distance permissible is 5% of the total route length. In this case, as per the report of the enquiry officer the total overlapping distance is within the permissible limit.

We have examined the application, report, connected files in detail;

We have also verified the objections received in the open hearing of this authority.

No other legal impediments were observed in this application and therefore fresh regular stage carriage permit on the proposed route is **granted** to a suitable stage carriage subject to the settlement of timings.

The grantee of the permit is directed to produce the current records of a stage carriage for endorsing the granted permit within thirty days of communication of this decision as per Rule 159(2) of KMV Rules, failing which the grant of this regular permit will be treated as revoked without further notice.

Item No.15

Heard the learned counsel appeared for the applicant, the representatives of the STU and the objectors.

This is to consider the application for fresh S/C permit to operate on the route **CHENAPPADY-PONKUNNAM-MANIMALA** via Paruthumala Jn, Mannamplavu, Manakkad Temple, Aravinda Hospital, KVMS Jn, Ponkunnam, Manjapallikkunnu, Chirakkadavu Temple, Thekkethukavala and Kailathukavala as **Ordinary** Service.

The application along with the connected files are verified. The enquiry on the application was conducted through Motor Vehicle Inspector, Joint RTO Kanjirappally. The enquiry officer stated that the proposed route is an intra-district route and the total route length is 25.2 kms. There is an overlapping of 770 meters in the notified routes. As per the existing norms of notification, maximum overlapping distance permissible is 5% of the total route length. In this case, as per the report of the enquiry officer the total overlapping distance is within the permissible limit.

We have also verified the objections received in the open hearing of this authority.

On examining the proposed time schedule it is noticed that the applicant intends to concentrate the service between Ponkunnam and Manimala with lesser number of cut-trips to Chenappady.

One of the objectives of this authority is to provide more opportunities for the travelling public, especially in the less-served areas.

Thus, we are of the opinion that this proposal needs to be re-worked for the benefit of travelling public by providing more travelling facilities to the common public.

Hence, we direct the applicant to modify the proposed timings by including more number of cut-trips to Chenappady in the existing time frame in public interest.

Place the application along with the modified timings before this authority.

Thus the decision on this application is ***adjourned***.

Item No.16

Heard the learned counsel appeared for the applicant, the representatives of the STU and the objectors.

This is to consider the application for fresh S/C permit to operate on the route **RAMAPURAM TEMPLE-PALA** via Ramapuram Temple, Ramapuram Police Station, Ramapuram Jn, Chakkampuzha, Vellilappally, Govt Ayurveda Hospital, Mundupalam, Pala Kurisupally Jn, Pala Stadium Jn, Pala Old BS, Puthenpallikkunnu, RV Jn, Pala Kottaramattom BS as **Ordinary** Service.

The application along with the connected files are verified.

The enquiry on the application was conducted through Motor Vehicle Inspector, Joint RTO Pala. The enquiry officer stated that the proposed route is an intra-district route and the total route length is 15.5 kms. There is an overlapping of 600 meters in the notified routes. As per the existing norms of notification, maximum overlapping distance permissible is 5% of the total route length. In this case, as per the report of the enquiry officer the total overlapping distance is within the permissible limit.

Objections raised in the open hearing of this authority were considered as per law.

The representatives of the STU raised objection regarding the distance of overlapping within Pala town limits between the portion from Hospital Jn to Kottaramattom BS. On verification of the same its specifically mentioned in the enquiry report that the line of traverse of the proposed route to Pala Kottaramattom BS is through Puthenpallikunnu and RV Jn. Hence the objection raised regarding the same is overruled. No other legal impediments were observed in this application.

Therefore fresh regular stage carriage permit on the proposed route is **granted** to a suitable stage carriage subject to the settlement of timings.

The grantee of the permit is directed to produce the current records of a stage carriage for endorsing the granted permit within thirty days of communication of this decision as per Rule 159(2) of KMV Rules, failing which the grant of this regular permit will be treated as revoked without further notice.

Item No.17

Heard the learned counsel appeared for the applicant, the representatives of the STU and the objectors.

This is to re-consider the application for fresh S/C permit to operate on the route **CHANGANACHERRY – PAILIKKAVALA** via Bypass, Chethipuzha kadavu, Kurisummoodu, Valiyakulam, Cheeramchira, Palachuvad, Pandanchira, Onnamattom, Njaliakuzhy, Ezhakunnel Pady and Pongamthanam as **Ordinary** Service.

The application for grant of fresh regular permit on the above intra-district route was considered by the RTA in its sitting held on 24.05.2022 vide Item No.7 and adjourned on the basis of the observation that the route enquiry report was not specific and not in tune with the application.

A direction for submitting a specific route enquiry report was given to Motor Vehicles Inspector, Joint RTO Changanassery. The enquiry officer has sought more time to prepare a detailed report due to administrative reasons.

Thus the Secretary RTA is directed to place the application along with the specific reports of re-enquiry before this authority in the very next open hearing.

Hence, the decision on this application is **adjourned**.

Item No.18

Heard the learned counsel appeared for the applicant, the representatives of the STU and the objectors.

This is to consider the application for fresh S/C permit to operate on the route **PATHAMPUZHA-KODUNGOOR** via Poonjar, Erattupetta, Panackapalam, Bharanganam, Pala Old Bus Stand, Govt Hospital Jn, Civil Station, Puthenpallikunnu, RV Junction, Pala Kottaramattom BS, Mutholy, Mevada, Kozhuvanal, Poovathilapu, Pallickathodu and Kayoori as **Ordinary** Service.

This is an application for a fresh regular stage carriage permit on the above intra-district route, An enquiry on the application was conducted through the Motor Vehicles Inspector, Joint RTO Pala. As per the report this is an intra-district route with a route length of 49 kms and there is an overlapping of 2 kms in the notified routes. As per the existing norms of notification, maximum

overlapping distance permissible is 5% of the total route length. In this case, as per the report of the enquiry officer the total overlapping distance is within permissible limit.

We have examined the application, report and connected files in detail; all objections raised in the open hearing of this authority were also considered.

On an unbiased examination of the present density of Stage carriage services on the proposed route the following facts are observed.

The enquiry report states that the route portion between Pathampuzha and Erattupetta is ill served but the same is not the case between Erattupetta-Pala and Pala-Kodungoor. The route portion between Erattupetta-Pala has high density of stage carriage services of both STU and private operators. In view of the existing wafer thin time gaps in the sector we are of the common opinion that further issuance of stage carriage permits on these routes will result in un-healthy competition and accidents. Also adding name sake cut trip to an en-route intermediate point like Bharananganam which is situated in a high density sector is not encouraged considering the present traffic condition. Even the conduct of timing conference will not be normally possible, since the time gaps is almost negligible.

This authority is of the view that it must be more cautious while dealing with the application for grant of fresh regular permit in an already saturated sector. Choking an already saturated sector with further stage carriage services unmindful of the detrimental effects that it may cause to the public safety is against the interests of promoting an efficient public transport system.

Hence we are of the common view that granting a fresh permit on the proposed route Pathampuzha-Kodungoor cannot be entertained on the above mentioned reasons.

Therefore the application for fresh stage carriage permit is ***rejected***.

Item No.19

Heard the learned counsel appeared for the applicant, the representatives of the STU and the objectors.

This is to consider the application for fresh S/C permit to operate on the route **MALIKAKADAVU-ETTUMANOOR** via Chakkarimukku, Kannanchira, Njaliakuzhy, Puthuppally, Manarcad, Kavumpady, Thiruvanchoor and Peroor as **Ordinary** Service.

We have considered the application and verified the connected records in detail. Representation from public, specifying the need of a stage carriage permit were also considered.

The enquiry on the application was conducted through Motor Vehicle Inspector Kottayam. The enquiry officer stated that the proposed route is an intra-district route and the total route length is 32.3 kms. There is an overlapping of 130 meters in the notified routes. As per the existing norms of notification, maximum overlapping distance permissible is 5% of the total route length. In this case , as per the report of the enquiry officer the total overlapping distance is within the permissible limit.

We have also verified the objections received in the open hearing of this authority.

The enquiry officer in his report stated that the route portion between Malikakadavu and Njaliakuzhy is ill served.

On examining the proposed time schedule it is noticed that the applicant intends to concentrate the service between Puthuppally Pally and Ettumanoor with a name sake cut trip in the morning and evening to the ill-served sector between Njaliakuzhy and Malikakadavu.

One of the objectives of this authority is to provide more opportunities for the travelling public, especially in the ill-served areas.

Thus, we are of the opinion that this proposal needs to be re-worked for the benefit of travelling public by providing more travelling facilities to the people inhabiting the area between Malikakadavu and Njaliakuzhy. Moreover in the proposed route the applicant has mentioned one of the intermediate point in the time schedule and the route proposal as Puthupally Pally. This authority is of the opinion that the existence of terminal facilities at Puthuppally cannot be overlooked.

Hence, we direct the applicant

a) to modify the proposed time scheduled in such way as to operate more number of trips to the ill-served Malikakadavu area within the existing time frame in public interest.

b) specifically mention the passing time at Puthuppally in view of the terminal facilities available there.

Place the application along with the modified timings in the next open meeting of this authority.

Hence the decision on this application is ***adjourned.***

Item No.20

Heard the learned counsel appeared for the applicant, the representatives of the STU and the objectors.

This is to consider the application for **endorsing** the grant of fresh regular stage carriage permit in respect of **S/C KL 38 A 3477 or a suitable stage carriage** to operate on the route **PALA KOTTARAMATTOM BS-KANJIRAPPALLY-KALATHUVA** via Panackapalam, Erattupetta, Thidanadu, Pinnakkanadu, Poonjar and Kalathuva as **Ordinary** Service with proposed timings.

We have considered the application and verified the connected records that is available, judgment of the Hon'ble High Court in WP (C) No.31807 of 2022 in detail. The relevant Sections of the MV Act and rules pertaining to the application were also perused.

As per the records the permit on the proposed route was granted by the RTA vide Item No.11 dated 30.11.2017 and granted vide Order No.G1/54913/2016/K subject to settlement of timings.

The applicant in his affirmation has merely stated that he couldn't proceed with the application.

The applicant through the learned counsel tried to put forth the claim for endorsement of the regular permit that was granted way back in the year 2017 in the backdrop of the judgment of Hon'ble High Court in WP (C) No.31807 of 2022. The representatives of the STU vehemently objected to the submissions made across by the learned counsel citing that a permit shall stand cancelled without the RTA requiring to cancel it as per the dictum laid down in Seethal vs RTA,Trichur-2003 KHC 1126; 2003(3) KLT357:2003 (2) KLJ NOC 39.

We are of the view that the applicant has submitted the request for endorsing the permit along with the judgment to cunningly evade the overriding effects of

KMV Rule 159 that has on his request. This authority cannot ignore the lawful provisions laid out in acts and rules and stand with the whims and fancies of the applicant.

Hence, in the light of above facts the request for endorsing the grant of fresh regular permit is **rejected**.

The Secretary, RTA is also directed to file an OP(C) against the judgment of the Hon'ble court in WP(C) No. 31807/2022 citing the legal impediment in endorsing the permit granted to the applicant.

Item No.21

Heard the learned counsel appeared for the applicant, the representatives of the STU and the objectors.

This is to re-consider the application for fresh S/C permit to operate on the route **MANDIRAM - CHERTHALA** via Homeo College, Thannimoodu, Malikakadavu, Pulimoodu, Chethipuzha, Kurisummoodu, Changanacherry, Nalunnakkal, Pandanchira, Njaliakuzhy, Pannimattam, Cement Jn., Thiruvathukkal, Illickal, Kumarakom, Bund Road, & Varanadu and **return trip** from **CHERTHALA** via Varanad, Kumarakom, Illickal, Mini Civil Station, Thirunakkara, Nagampadam, Railway station, Rubber Board, Kanjikuzhy as **Ordinary** Service.

The application for fresh regular permit on the above proposed inter-district route was considered by the RTA Kottayam vide Item No.5 dated 03.11.2018 and rejected on the basis of the finding that there is objectionable overlapping in the Kottayam-Neendoor Complete exclusion scheme. Against the decision of the RTA the applicant filed an M.V.A.R.P No.133/2018 before the Hon'ble STAT. The order pronounced by the STAT directs the Regional Transport Authority to consider the application in tune with the judgment in W.A 62/2012 dated 24.01.2012. This application is being reconsidered in the light of above order.

This authority considered the application, verified the connected files and judgments, heard the objections raised by en-route operators and representatives of STU in detail.

As per the enquiry report this is an inter district route with a total route length of 102.2 kms out of which 8 kms lies under the jurisdiction of sister RTA Alapuzha. The route enquiry officer has also pointed out that in the proposed route there is an over-lapping of 4.5 kms in the notified portions i.e 4.40 % of the total route length of 102.2 kms which is under the permissible limit as per the existing norms of notifications. In this case the overlapping distance is in the brim of permissible limits.

The main grievance of the applicant is that the application was rejected solely on the basis of the finding that the route portion from Seemati Round to Baker Jn for a distance of 100 meter objectionably overlaps Kottayam-Neendoor Complete exclusion scheme. The learned counsel who appeared for the applicant contended that whenever a new scheme is brought into force, the earlier schemes automatically stands modified by implication of pro-tanto and that the overlapping route portion from Seematti Round to Baker Junction on the proposed route falls completely under the new Ernakulam-Thekkady scheme.

In the mean time the objectors and representatives of the STU at the outset strongly objected to the findings of the enquiry officer and regarding the line of traverse of the proposed route. Also there was dispute regarding the actual route length and methods employed in measuring the overlapping distance.

On perusal of the enquiry reports, submissions and objections made across before this authority we are of the common opinion that these objections are sustainable.

There needs to be more clarity pertaining to the actual distance of the route and the length of overlapping portions thereof. Also the contentions of the objectors and the findings of the enquiry officer are contradictory in nature.

Thus this authority is not in a position to take a right approach with the reports and findings.

Hence, the Secretary RTA will

a) Re-enquire the matter in detail after giving due notice to the representatives of STU, objectors/affected parties and submit a detailed report with specific remark on whether the proposed route is feasible for stage carriage operation in the light of the present density of stage carriage services on Kottayam-Cherthala route. The report should also contain specific remarks as to exact distance of overlapping in the notified routes.

b) Place the application with specific re-enquiry reports before this authority.

Hence the decision on this application is ***adjourned***.

Item No.22

Heard the learned counsel appeared for the applicant, the representatives of the STU and the objectors.

This is to re-consider the application for issuing fresh regular permit granted by the RTA Kottayam dated:-22.05.2012 on the route **Paruthumpara – Kottayam** via Chozhiyackadu, Parackalkadavu, Nalkavala, Devalokam, Kanjikuzhy, Collectorate, Logos Jn., Old Bus Stand, and return through Kanjikuzhy, Devalokam, Nalkavala, Parackalkadavu and Chozhiyackadu as **Ordinary** Service.

This application was initially considered and granted in the year 2008. The decision of the RTA dtd 09/07/2008 was communicated to the applicant on 30/09/2008. But while typing the decision of Item No 15, decision of item No.17 was typed as adjourned instead of granted and communicated to the applicant. Subsequently, RTA Kottayam dtd 22/05/2012 rectified the mistake happened and granted regular permit on the route **Paruthumpara – Kottayam** subject to settlement of timings.

Due to pendency of WP (C) No.20524 of 2012 before the Hon'ble High Court the permit granted by the RTA was not issued. After the pronouncement of the final judgment in the above writ petition the matter was again considered by the RTA on 22.02.2018 vide Item No.6 and rejected on the basis of the finding that the total overlapping length in the proposed is beyond the permissible limit and sanction granting fresh regular permit by the RTA dated 22.05.2012 was revoked.

Against the decision of the RTA the applicant filed a revision petition before the Hon'ble STAT in M.V.A.R.P No.75/2018 which directs the Secretary RTA to consider the matter afresh after hearing the parties concerned within two months from the receipt of the copy of the order as per law. Since the matter

pertains to the issuance of fresh permit the same was referred by the Secretary to this authority to take a decision.

This authority considered the application, verified the connected records, files and judgments and orders of the Hon'ble High Court and STAT in detail.

The STAT in its order in M.V.A.R.P No.75/2018 has unambiguously directed the Secretary RTA to consider the application afresh. On considering the application afresh notwithstanding the perusal of application and enquiry reports that was already been considered by this authority in its previous sitting, this authority is convinced that the applicability of conditions as stipulated in G.O. (P) No 8/2017/Trans dated 23.03.2017 falls squarely on while considering the above application afresh. As per the above mentioned notification there is a restriction on granting stage carriage permits on notified routes permitting to overlap 5 kms or 5 % of the total length of the route, whichever is less for the purpose of intersection. In this case, as per the enquiry report the total overlapping distance in the notified portions is 1 km, which is higher than 5 % of the total route length.

Hence as per the provisions stipulated in the aforesaid Government Order, this authority is of the view that there is legal impediment in granting the permit. Thus, the application for issuance of fresh regular permit on the route Paruthumpara-Kottayam is **rejected** herewith.

II. Concurrence

Item No.23

This is a request from sister RTA, Idukki to consider the application for issuing **concurrence for fresh regular stage carriage permit** on the route **MUTTUKADE-BISONVALLEY-PALA** as **Ordinary** Service.

The sister **RTA Idukki** held on **04.06.2022** considered the application for grant of fresh regular permit vide **Item No.17**.

A detailed enquiry was conducted through Motor Vehicles Inspector, Joint RTO, Uzhavoor. As per the report of the enquiry officer, a distance of 21.3 kms from Athani to Pala Kottaramattom BS lies under the jurisdiction of this authority. There is an overlapping of 1.7 kms in the Kottayam-Kattappana notified scheme from Pala Kottaramattom BS to Stadium Jn. On detailed perusal of the route enquiry report and connected records, this authority is of the opinion that there is no legal impediment in allowing concurrence.

Hence concurrence is **granted** from this authority on the application of fresh regular permit subject to the right of primary authority to take a final decision on the application for fresh stage carriage permit.

Item No.24

This is a request from sister RTA, Idukki to consider the application for issuing **concurrence for fresh regular stage carriage permit** on the route **MURICKASSERY-NAGAMPADOM BS** as **Ordinary** Service.

The sister **RTA Idukki** held on **04.06.2022** considered the application for grant of fresh regular permit vide **Item No.15**.

A detailed enquiry was conducted through Motor Vehicles Inspector, Joint RTO, Uzhavoor.

As per the report of the enquiry officer, a distance of 54.7 kms from Palachuvadu to Nagampadom BS lies under the jurisdiction of this authority. There is total overlapping of 3.3 kms out of which 0.7 kms is in Kottayam-Kattappana notified scheme from Kidangoor Church to Police Station Jn on State Highway, 0.1 km of overlapping in Kottayam-Thekkady and Ernakulam-Thekkady scheme from Govt. UP School Jn to Manarcadu Jn, 2.5 kms of overlapping in Trivandrum-Kottayam via Ranni scheme from Kalathipadi to Collectorate Jn.

On detailed perusal of the route enquiry report and connected records, this authority is of the opinion that there is no legal impediment in allowing concurrence.

Hence concurrence is **granted** from this authority on the application of fresh regular permit subject to the right of primary authority to take a final decision on the application for fresh stage carriage permit.

Item No.25

This is a request from sister RTA, Pathanamthitta to consider the application for issuing **concurrence for fresh regular stage carriage permit** on the route **KARUNAGAPPALLY PVT BUS STAND-PALA** as **LSOS**.

The sister **RTA Pathanamthitta** held on **23.05.2022** considered the application for grant of fresh regular permit vide **Item No.03**.

A detailed enquiry was conducted through Motor Vehicles Inspector, Joint RTO, Kanjirappally. As per the report of the enquiry officer, a distance of 41 kms from Vallamchira to Pala Kottaramattom BS lies under the jurisdiction of this authority. There is total overlapping of 1.2 kms out of which 100 meters is in Kottayam-Thekkady notified scheme on NH 183 at Ponkunnam, 700 meters of overlapping in Kottayam-Kattapana scheme from Pala Hospital Jn to Municipal Stadium Jn, 400 meters of overlapping in Changanassery-Changanassery circular scheme from Manimala Market Jn to Manimala BS.

On detailed perusal of the route enquiry report and connected records, this authority is of the opinion that there is no legal impediment in allowing concurrence.

Hence concurrence is **granted** from this authority on the application of fresh regular permit subject to the right of primary authority to take a final decision on the application for fresh stage carriage permit.

III. Variation Of Permit Conditions

Item No.26

Heard.

This is to consider the application for variation of regular permit in respect of the stage carriage **KL-33-F-1214** operating on the route Manimala-Kanjirappally so as to effect variation of the existing route between Chenappady Alumchuvadu Jn and Kallarakkavu Jn via Factorypady, Elamkavu Devi temple, Karimpukayam.

The variation sought for includes

- a) curtailment of two trips between Kanjirappally and Chenappady.
- b) curtailment of two trips between Manimala and Kanjirappally.
- c) addition of 5 trips through the deviated portion between Chenappady and Manimala.

We have considered the application and verified the connected records in detail.

The objections for and against the application were also heard and considered.

The route enquiry officer has stated the following:

In this case, the permit holder intends to curtail the existing route portion from Chenappady Alumchuvadu Jn to Kallarakkavu Jn through Chenappady town, Kadavanalkadavu Bridge and Paruthumala. The report also states that the curtailed portion is served by other stage carriages and that there is no scarcity of transportation.

As per the report, through the varied portion there are no stage carriages as of now. Moreover on perusal of the representations submitted before this authority and report of the route enquiry officer we are of the view that the proposed variation will be beneficial to the people inhabiting the Karimpukayam area which has no stage carriage services.

On considering the application in accordance with the provisions contained in the relevant acts and rules and report of the enquiry officer we don't see any impediment in granting the variation as applied for.

Hence, application for variation of permit is **granted** on the applied route subject to settlement of timings.

Item No.27

Heard.

This is to consider the application for variation of regular permit in respect of the stage carriage **KL-05-AL-156** operating on the route Karukachal-Koruthodu so as to curtail the existing route portion between Karukachal and Kottayam and altering the starting and halting termini as Kottayam.

We have considered the application and verified the connected records and objections in detail.

The enquiry officer in his report has pointed out that the proposed curtailment will adversely affect the travelling public. No special circumstances has arisen to curtail the existing route portion.

This authority considered the observations of the route enquiry officer with due seriousness and we do not want to overrule the same. We have also considered this application in accordance with the provisions contained in the relevant acts and rules, we could not find any such circumstances warranting a curtailment of the existing route portion. As per the opinion of this authority the interest of the travelling public on the existing route has to be given due importance.

Hence on the above factors the application for variation of permit is hereby **rejected**.

Item No.28

Heard.

This is to consider the application for variation of regular permit in respect of the stage carriage **KL-68-1819** operating on the route Pala-Kodungoor. The applicant intends to curtail the last trip from Kodungoor to Pala and add the first trip from Kodungoor to Pala. The halting termini is changed from Pala to Kodungoor.

We have considered the application and verified the connected records and objections in detail.

The enquiry officer has stated that the proposed trip curtailment will not adversely affect the travelling public since the existing route is adequately served.

This authority considered the observations of the route enquiry officer with due seriousness and we do not want to overrule the same.

We have also considered this application in accordance with the provisions contained in the relevant acts and rules and don't see any impediment in granting the variation as applied for.

Hence, application for variation of permit is **granted** on the applied route subject to settlement of timings.

Item No.29

Heard.

This is to consider the application for variation of regular permit in respect of the stage carriage **KL-33-M-2461** operating on the route Changanassery-Medical College so as to curtail the existing route portion between Medical College and Kottayam.

We have considered the application and verified the connected records in detail. The arguments for and against the applications were also heard and considered.

This authority on perusal of the application observed that the real intention behind the trip curtailment is to exclude the route portion coming under Kottayam-Neendoor Complete exclusion scheme.

The curtailment portion includes many academic institutions, medical college hospital, government offices frequented by the common public. This authority cannot ignore the adverse affects of curtailment that may cause to the travelling public.

On seeking an explanation regarding the alternate arrangements to be made to mitigate the effects of excluding the existing operators from the Kottayam-Neendoor Complete exclusion scheme the representatives of STU couldn't offer any convincing explanation in this regard.

We are of the common opinion that on applications for variations of permit for excluding the route portions from Kottayam-Neendoor Complete exclusion scheme taking a call subject to the Government decision in this regard will be the right approach.

Based on the above observation the decision on the application for variation is **adjourned**.

Item No.30

Heard.

This is to consider the application for variation of regular permit in respect of the stage carriage **KL-38-C-151** operating on the route Kottayam-Neeloor. The applicant intends to curtail the last trip between Pala and Neeloor.

We have considered the application and verified the connected records and objections in detail.

The enquiry officer has stated that the proposed trip curtailment will not adversely affect the travelling public since there are other services to Pala in the existing time frame.

This authority considered the observations of the route enquiry officer with due seriousness and we do not want to overrule the same.

We have also considered this application in accordance with the provisions contained in the relevant acts and rules and don't see any impediment in granting the variation as applied for.

Hence, application for variation of permit is **granted** on the applied route subject to settlement of timings.

Item No.31

Heard. This is to

a) peruse the Judgment of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP (C) No.16735 of 2022 dated:-06.06.2022.

b) To consider the application for variation of regular permit in respect of the stage carriage **KL-33-H-3570** operating on the route Pullarikunnu-Cholathadam.

The variation sought for includes:

a) curtailment of the route portion between Pullarikunnu and Cholathadam to exclude the route portion coming under Kottayam-Neendoor Complete exclusion scheme.

We have considered the application and verified the connected records and objections in detail. The enquiry officer has reported that the proposed curtailment will adversely affect the existing travelling public.

This authority on perusal of the application observed that the real intention behind the trip curtailment is to exclude the route portion coming under Kottayam-Neendoor Complete exclusion scheme.

This authority cannot ignore the adverse affects of curtailment that may cause to the travelling public.

On seeking an explanation regarding the alternate arrangements to be made to mitigate the effects of excluding the existing operators from the Kottayam-Neendoor Complete exclusion scheme the representatives of STU couldn't offer any convincing explanation in this regard.

We are of the common opinion that on applications for variations of permit for excluding the route portions from Kottayam-Neendoor Complete exclusion scheme taking a call subject to the Government decision in this regard will be the right approach.

Based on the above observation the decision on the application for variation is ***adjourned.***

Item No.32

Heard.

This is to consider the application for variation of regular permit in respect of the stage carriage **KL-05-AH-3003** operating on the route Medical College-Ranni so as to curtail the existing route portion between Medical College and Kottayam.

We have considered the application and verified the connected records in detail. The arguments for and against the applications were also heard and considered.

This authority on perusal of the application observed that the real intention behind the trip curtailment is to exclude the route portion coming under Kottayam-Neendoor Complete exclusion scheme.

The curtailment portion includes many academic institutions, medical college hospital, government offices frequented by the common public.

This authority cannot ignore the adverse affects of curtailment that may cause to the travelling public.

On seeking an explanation regarding the alternate arrangements to be made to mitigate the effects of excluding the existing operators from the Kottayam-Neendoor Complete exclusion scheme the representatives of STU couldn't offer any convincing explanation in this regard.

We are of the common opinion that on applications for variations of permit for excluding the route portions from Kottayam-Neendoor Complete exclusion scheme taking a call subject to the Government decision in this regard will be the right approach.

Based on the above observation the decision on the application for variation is ***adjourned.***

Item No.33

Applicant absent. Decision on this application is ***adjourned***.

Item No.34

Heard.

This is to consider the application for variation of regular permit in respect of the stage carriage **KL-62-B-4290** operating on the route Edamury-Kottayam.

The variation sought for includes

a) deviation of the existing route portion between Chamampathal and Kodungoor through SVR NSS College Jn without change in the total route length.

We have considered the application and verified the connected records in detail.

The objections for and against the application were also heard and considered.

The route enquiry officer has stated the following:

The deviation from the existing route portion will help the students of the college en-route.

There is no scheme specially included for STU in the varied route portion.

Moreover on perusal of the representations submitted before this authority and report of the route enquiry officer we are of the view that the proposed variation will be beneficial to the students of the college situated en-route.

On considering the application in accordance with the provisions contained in the relevant acts and rules and report of the enquiry officer we don't see any impediment in granting the variation as applied for.

Hence, application for variation of permit is ***granted*** on the applied route subject to settlement of timings.

Item No.35

Heard.

This is to consider the application for variation of regular permit in respect of the stage carriage **KL-33-E-3158** operating on the route Pala-Kodungoor.

The variation sought for includes

a) variation of the existing route portion between Naiplavu and Koorali through Chengalam.

b) There is curtailment of 3.6 kms and extension of route length by 5.2 kms.

We have considered the application and verified the connected records in detail.

The objections for and against the application and representations were also heard and considered.

The route enquiry officer has stated the following:

The variation of the existing route is beneficial to the people going to the schools, pilgrim centers, hospitals en-route.

There is no scheme specially included for STU in the existing route portion.

Moreover on perusal of the representations submitted before this authority and report of the route enquiry officer we are of the view that the proposed variation will be beneficial to the travelling public.

On considering the application in accordance with the provisions contained in the relevant acts and rules and report of the enquiry officer we don't see any impediment in granting the variation as applied for.

Hence, application for variation of permit is **granted** on the applied route subject to settlement of timings.

Item No.36

Heard.

This is to re-consider the application for variation of regular permit in respect of the stage carriage **KL-17-C-3133** operating on the route Mathunkal-Moothedathukavu.

The application was considered by the RTA in its sitting held on 24.05.2022 and adjourned on the basis of the finding that the proposed variation violated the provisions contained in Section 80(3) of MV Act.

The applicant was directed to submit a modified application and the item was adjourned.

In response to the decision of RTA the applicant has submitted a modified application in tune with the Section 80(3) of MV Act.

The variation sought for includes

a) extending the existing route portion from Mathunkal to Chemmanakari North gate for a distance of 1.1 kms.

The enquiry officer has reported that the proposed variation will be beneficial to the students, labourers and public in Chemmanakary and Mathunkal area and the patients depending on the hospital nearby.

Fitness certificate has been received from the authorities for the route coming under the virgin portion.

We have considered the application and verified the connected records in detail.

Moreover on perusal of the representations submitted before this authority and report of the route enquiry officer we are of the view that the proposed variation will be beneficial to the travelling public.

On considering the application in accordance with the provisions contained in the relevant acts and rules and report of the enquiry officer We don't see any impediment in granting the variation as applied for.

Hence, application for variation of permit is **granted** on the applied route subject to settlement of timings.

Item No.37

Heard.

This is to consider the application for variation of regular permit in respect of the stage carriage **KL-33-J-3162** operating on the route Pakkanam-Changanassery.

The variation sought for includes

- a) curtailment of the existing route portion between Pakkanam and Mundakayam for a distance of 8 kms.
- b) One of the termini is changed from Pakkanam to Mundakayam.

The enquiry officer has reported that the curtailment portion of the route doesn't have heavy scarcity of transportation.

We have considered the application and verified the connected records in detail.

The objections for and against the application and representations were also heard and considered.

We are of the view that the report of the route enquiry officer is reliable in taking a call on this application.

On considering the application in accordance with the provisions contained in the relevant acts and rules and report of the enquiry officer we don't see any impediment in granting the variation as applied for.

Hence, application for variation of permit is **granted** on the applied route subject to settlement of timings.

Item No.38

Heard.

This is to consider the application for variation of regular permit in respect of the stage carriage **KL-05-S-2628** operating on the route Kallam-Edakunnam.

The variation sought for includes

- a) extension of the existing route portion from Edakunnam to Inchiyani for a distance of 5 kms.
- b) One of the termini is changed from Edakunnam to Inchiyani.

We have considered the application and verified the connected records in detail.

The objections for and against the application and representations were also heard and considered.

The enquiry officer has pointed out that the proposed extension will benefit the people and students en-route. Moreover there is no scheme specially included for STU in the extended portion.

Also the proposed extension doesn't violate Section 80(3) of MV Act.

On considering the application on its merits and in accordance with the provisions contained in the relevant acts and rules and report of the enquiry officer we don't see any impediment in granting the variation as applied for.

Hence, application for variation of permit is **granted** subject to settlement of timings.

Item No.39

Heard.

This is to consider the application for variation of regular permit in respect of the stage carriage **KL-33-B-3538** operating on the route Kottayam-Karippakallu.

The variation sought for includes

- a) curtailment of the existing route portion between Karippakallu and Pallickathodu for a distance of 4 km.
- b) One of the termini is changed from Karippakallu to Pallickathodu.

We have considered the application and verified the connected records in detail.

The objections for and against the application and representations were also heard and considered.

The enquiry officer has stated the following:

- a) The proposed curtailment will stop the only stage carriage service on this route.
- b) The curtailment will adversely affect the people and students inhabiting the ill-served Karippakallu area.

We are of the opinion that the interests of the travelling public of the existing route has to be given due importance.

Relying on the report of the enquiry officer and considering the application in accordance with the provisions contained in the relevant acts and rules it is revealed that the proposed curtailment is against public interest.

On the above grounds the application for variation of permit is ***rejected***.

Item No.40

Heard.

This is to consider the application for variation of regular permit in respect of the stage carriage **KL-35-G-4820** operating on the route Kumily-Kayamkulam as LSOS.

The variation sought for includes

- a) curtailment of the existing route portion between Mavelikara-Kayamkulam for a distance of 12 kms.
- b) One of the termini is changed from Kayamkulam to Mavelikara.

We have considered the application and verified the connected records and order of the Hon'ble STAT in M.P. No1124/2022 in M.V.A.A No214/2022 in detail.

The objections for and against the application and representations were also heard and considered.

The present permit has a total route length above 140 kms.

As per KMV Rule 2(oa) the Ordinary Limited Stop Service is permitted to operate only upto a distance of 140 kms.

Through this curtailment the applicant intends to limit the route length below 140 kms.

An enquiry has been conducted through Joint RTO Mavelikara which states that the proposed curtailment of the route portion between Mavelikara and Kayamkulam limits the total route length below permissible limits.

On considering the application on its merits and in accordance with the provisions contained in the relevant acts and rules and report of the enquiry officer we don't see any impediment in granting the variation as applied for.

Hence, application for variation of permit is **granted** on the applied route subject to settlement of timings.

Item No.41

Heard.

This is to consider the application for variation of regular permit in respect of the stage carriage **KL-40-6566** operating on the route Kaippuzhamuttu-Vazhamana.

The variation sought for includes

- a) curtailment of a set of existing trips between Vaikom and Vazhamana.
- b) extension of the route portion from Vaikom to T V Puram for a distance of 6 km.
- c) change of one termini from Vazhamana to TV Puram.

We have considered the application and verified the connected records and objections in detail.

An enquiry on the application was conducted through Motor Vehicles Inspector, Joint RTO Vaikom. The report states that the proposed variation is beneficial to public and students.

This authority considered the observations of the route enquiry officer with due seriousness and we do not want to overrule the same.

We have also considered this application in accordance with the provisions contained in the relevant acts and rules and don't see any impediment in granting the variation as applied for.

Hence, application for variation of permit is **granted** on the applied route subject to settlement of timings.

Item No.42

Heard.

This is to consider the application for variation of regular permit in respect of the stage carriage **KL 05 AN 5545** operating on the route Vazhamana-Kaippuzhamuttu.

The variation sought for includes

- a) extension of last trip from Vaikom to Kaippuzhamuttu and change in halting place to Kaipuzhamuttu.
- b) addition of a trip to Vazhamana and curtailment of the route portion between Bund road and Kaipuzhamuttu.
- c) change of one termini from Vazhamana to TV Puram.

We have considered the application and verified the connected records and objections in detail.

An enquiry on the application was conducted through Motor Vehicles Inspector, Joint RTO Vaikom. The report states that the proposed variation is beneficial to public and students and that the curtailment of the trip in the route portion between Kaipuzhamuttu and Bund road will not seriously affect travelling public since the sector is well served.

On perusal of the objection submitted by the representatives of STU its noted that there is additional overlapping of 500 meters in the notified sector from Valiyakavala to Link Road which is violation of the Clause 19 of G.O. (P) 8/2017/Trans dated 23.03.2017.

The proposed variation violates Section 80(3) of MV Act.

Considering the above facts the application submitted by the permit holder is not maintainable.

On the above grounds the application for variation of permit is **rejected**.

Item No.43

Heard.

This is to consider the application for variation of regular permit in respect of the stage carriage **KL-05-AD-9865** operating on the route Pulickalkavala-Kottayam.

The variation sought for includes

a) curtailment of route portion between Pulickal Kavala and Chappathu for a distance of 3.2 kms.

b) extension of the entire trip from Chappathu to Pallickathodu and providing one additional trip from Chapathu to Pampady.

We have considered the application and verified the connected records and objections in detail.

The enquiry officer in his report has pointed out that the absence of the only service may deprive the public of the existing travelling facilities.

Also as per the report there is an objectionable overlapping of 300 meters in the notified sector from Pampady MGM Junction to Pampady BS which is violation of the Clause 19 of G.O. (P) 8/2017/Trans dated 23.03.2017.

This authority is of the view that the objection submitted by the representatives of the STU regarding the overlapping is sustainable and we don't want to overrule the same.

The proposed variation also violates Section 80(3) of MV Act.

Considering the above facts the application submitted by the permit holder is not maintainable.

On the above grounds the application for variation of permit is **rejected**.

Item No.44

Heard.

This is to consider the application for variation of regular permit in respect of the stage carriage **KL-34-D-7687** operating on the route Elamkadu Top-Mundakayam.

The variation sought for includes

a) curtailment of one trip between Elamkadu top and Mundakayam for a distance of 16 km.

b) extension of one trip from Mundakayam to Kuzhimavu

We have considered the application and verified the connected records and objections in detail.

It is noted that there is an objectionable overlapping of 150 meters in the notified sector from Mundakayam BS to Cosway Jn which is violation of the Clause 19 of G.O. (P) 8/2017/Trans dated 23.03.2017.

Thus the proposed variation sought for is in violation of the provisions contained in the existing notification.

Considering the above facts the application submitted by the permit holder is not maintainable.

On the above grounds the application for variation of permit is **rejected**.

Item No.45

Heard.

This is to consider the application for variation of regular permit in respect of the stage carriage **KL-33-D-8592** operating on the route Chingavanam-Vadavathoor Temple.

The variation sought for includes

a) curtailment of a set of trips in morning and evening between Chingavanam and Kottayam.

b) extension of the entire trip from Kanjiram Jetty to Malarickal.

We have considered the application and verified the connected records and objections in detail.

An enquiry on the application was conducted through Motor Vehicles Inspector, RTO Kottayam. The report states that the proposed variation is beneficial to public and students.

The extended portion of is an ill served route and comprise mostly rural areas and the proposed variation will be beneficial to the general public and students.

This authority considered the observations of the route enquiry officer with due seriousness and we do not want to overrule the same.

We have also considered this application in accordance with the provisions contained in the relevant acts and rules and don't see any impediment in granting the variation as applied for.

Hence, application for variation of permit is **granted** on the applied route subject to settlement of timings.

Item No.46

Heard.

a) This is to re-consider the application for variation of regular permit in respect of the stage carriage **KL-34-D-9814** operating on the route Kottayam-Vadasserikara.

b) Consider the decision of the RTA Pathanamthitta vide Supplementary Item No.10 dated 23.05.2022.

The application for variations of conditions of permit was considered by the RTA in its sitting held on 29.11.2021 vide item no.23 and adjourned for want of concurrence from sister RTA Pathanamthitta since the curtailed portion comes under the jurisdiction of that authority.

In response to the decision of this authority concurrence has been granted by sister RTA Pathanamthitta by citing that the proposed curtailment will not adversely affect the existing travelling facility.

On the basis of the above observation we see no legal impediment in granting the variation as sought for.

Hence, application for variation of permit is **granted** on the applied route subject to settlement of timings.

Item No.47

Heard.This is to

a) peruse the Judgment of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP (C) No.20077 of 2022 dated:-23.06.2022.

b)To consider the application for variation of regular permit in respect of the stage carriage **KL-02-BH-7670** operating on the route Pampady-Medical College.

The variation sought for includes:

a) curtailment of the route portion between Medical College and Ettumanoor to exclude the route portion coming under Kottayam-Neendoor Complete exclusion scheme.

We have considered the application and verified the connected records, objections, judgment of the Hon'ble court in detail. The enquiry officer has reported that the proposed curtailment will adversely affect the existing travelling public.

This authority on perusal of the application observed that the real intention behind the curtailment is to exclude the route portion coming under Kottayam-Neendoor Complete exclusion scheme.

The curtailment portion includes many academic institutions, medical college hospital, government offices frequented by the common public.

This authority cannot ignore the adverse affects of curtailment that it may cause to the travelling public. Also many objections and representations has been received from both public and organizations against the grant of variation as sought for.

On seeking an explanation regarding the alternate arrangements to be made to mitigate the effects of excluding the existing operators from the Kottayam-Neendoor Complete exclusion scheme the representatives of STU couldn't offer any convincing explanation in this regard.

We are of the common opinion that on applications for variations of permit for excluding the route portions from Kottayam-Neendoor Complete exclusion scheme taking a call subject to the Government decision in this regard will be the right approach.

Based on the above observation the decision on the application for variation is **adjourned**.

Item No.48

Heard.

This is to consider the application for variation of regular permit in respect of the stage carriage **KL-44-8199** operating on the route Ayarkunnam-Payyappadi.

The variation sought for includes

- a) extension of the existing route portion from Payyappadi to Kochumattom for a distance of 1.8 kms.
- b) One of the termini is changed from Payyapady to Kochumattom.

We have considered the application and verified the connected records in detail.

The objections for and against the application and representations were also heard and considered.

The enquiry officer has pointed out that the proposed extension will benefit the people and students en-route and that there is no sufficient stage carriages on the extended portion. On considering the application on its merits and in accordance with the provisions contained in the relevant acts and rules and report of the enquiry officer we don't see any impediment in granting the variation as applied for. Also the proposed extension doesn't violate Section 80(3) of MV Act.

Hence, application for variation of permit is **granted** subject to settlement of timings.

Item No.49

Heard.

This is to consider the application for variation of regular permit in respect of the stage carriage **KL-36-9099** operating on the route Kaippuzhamuttu-Ernakulam as LSOS.

The variation sought for includes

- a) extension of the existing route portion from Kaippuzhamuttu to Kumarakom for a distance of 7 kms.
- b) One of the termini is changed from Kaippuzhamuttu to Kumarakom.

We have considered the application and verified the connected records in detail.

The objections for and against the application and representations were also heard and considered.

The enquiry officer has pointed out that the proposed extension will benefit the people and students en-route. On considering the application on its merits and in accordance with the provisions contained in the relevant acts and rules and report of the enquiry officer we don't see any impediment in granting the variation as applied for.

There is no additional overlapping in the extended portion. Also the proposed extension doesn't violate Section 80(3) of MV Act.

Hence, application for variation of permit is **granted** subject to settlement of timings.

IV. Renewal of Stage Carriage Permit

Item No.50

Heard the learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is a belated application for renewal of regular permit of the Stage Carriage **KL-33-L-34** on the route **KOTTAYAM-ADICHIPUZHA** via Kanjikuzhy, Manarcadu, Pampady, kuttickal, Manthuruthy, Karukachal, Nedumkunnam, Pathanad, Manimala, Ponthenpuzha, Plachery, Mandamaruthy, Ranni and Valiyakulam as **Mofussil** service for a period of 5 years from the date of expiry. This permit is issued prior to **14.07.2009**.

The permit holder requested to condone the delay in filing the permit renewal application.

This authority considered the application and verified the records in detail.

The delay in submitting the application for renewal of regular permit is condoned and the permit renewal **granted** for a further period of 5 years from the date of expiry, subject to the clearance of Govt. dues, submission of Current records and production of No Objection Certificate from the financier, if applicable.

Item No.51

Heard the learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is a belated application for renewal of regular permit of the Stage Carriage **KL-05-Z-2343** on the route **KOTTAYAM-PAMPADY** via Kanjikuzhy, Puthuppally, Payyappady, Mundiackel and Manjady as **Town** service for a period of 5 years from the date of expiry. This permit is issued prior to **14.07.2009** and is a saved one.

The permit holder requested to condone the delay in filing the permit renewal application.

This authority considered the application and verified the records in detail.

The delay in submitting the application for renewal of regular permit is condoned and the permit renewal **granted** for a further period of 5 years from the date of expiry, subject to the clearance of Govt. dues, submission of Current records and production of No Objection Certificate from the financier, if applicable.

Item No.52

Heard the learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is a belated application for renewal of regular permit of the Stage Carriage **KL-34-C-1690** on the route **ELAMCADU-ERUMELY** via **Yendayar, Koottickal, Mundkkayam, Karinilam and Pulikkunnu** as **Mofussil** service for a period of 5 years from the date of expiry. This permit is issued prior to **14.07.2009** and is a saved one.

The permit holder requested to condone the delay in filing the permit renewal application.

This authority considered the application and verified the records in detail.

The delay in submitting the application for renewal of regular permit is condoned and the permit renewal **granted** for a further period of 5 years from the date of expiry, subject to the clearance of Govt. dues, submission of Current records and production of No Objection Certificate from the financier, if applicable.

Item No.53

Heard the learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for renewal of regular permit of the Stage Carriage **KL-17-F-1007** on the route **PONKUNNAM-CHERUVALLY TEMPLE** via **Chirakkadavu Temple, Thekkethukavala and Padanilam** as **Mofussil** service for a period of 5 years from the date of expiry.

This permit is issued after 14.07.2009 and it is not a saved one.

This authority considered the application and verified the records in detail.

As per the report of the enquiry officer, this is an intra district route having a total distance of 8 km. Out of the total route length of 8 kms there is an overlapping of 50 m which is 0.63 % of the total route length which is within the permissible limit as per Clause 5 (c) of the GO (P) No.8/2017/Trans dated:- 23.03.2017.

Hence the application for renewal of regular permit is **granted** for a further period of 5 years from the date of expiry if there is no legal impediment, subject to the clearance of Govt. dues, submission of Current records and production of No Objection Certificate from the financier, if applicable.

Item No.54

Heard the learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is a belated application for renewal of regular permit of the Stage Carriage **KL-35-A-1416** on the route **MARANGATTUPALLY-KANJIRAPPALLY** via **Vallichira, Pala, 12th Mile, Palakkad, Edamattam, Vilakkumadam, Paika, Kuruvikodu, Moozhikkadu, Thumpamada(Ericadu) and Pulimavu** as **Mofussil** service for a period of 5 years from the date of expiry. This permit is issued prior to **14.07.2009** and is a saved one.

The permit holder requested to condone the delay in filing the permit renewal application.

This authority considered the application and verified the records in detail.

The delay in submitting the application for renewal of regular permit is condoned and the permit renewal **granted** for a further period of 5 years from the date of expiry, subject to the clearance of Govt. dues, submission of Current records and production of No Objection Certificate from the financier, if applicable.

Item No.55

Heard the learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is a belated application for renewal of regular permit of the Stage Carriage **KL-34-C-1427** on the route **ELAMCADU-ERNAKULAM**, via **Yendayar, Koottickal, Mundakkayam, Kanjirappally, Erattupetta, Pala, Kuravilangadu, Kappumthala, Kaduthuruthy, Thalayolaparambu, Kanjiramattam, Trippunithura, and Vyttila** as **LSOS** for a period of 5 years from the date of expiry. This permit is issued prior to **14.07.2009** and is a saved one.

The permit holder requested to condone the delay in filing the permit renewal application.

This authority considered the application and verified the records in detail.

As per the report of the enquiry officer, this is an inter district route having a total distance of 119.7 km. Out of the total route length of 119.7 kms 95 kms lies in Kottayam District and 24.7 kms in Ernakulam district. Since the permit is a save one and on considering the application on its merits the delay in

submitting the application for renewal of regular permit is condoned and the permit renewal **granted** for a further period of 5 years from the date of expiry if there is no legal impediment , subject to the clearance of Govt. dues, submission of Current records and production of No Objection Certificate from the financier, if applicable.

Item No.56

Heard the learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is a belated application for renewal of regular permit of the Stage Carriage **KL-38-A-3477** on the route **KUMILY-ERNAKULAM via** Vandiperiyar, Peerumedu, Mundakayam, Kanjirappally, Ponkunnam, Paika, Pala, Marangattupilly, Kuravilangadu , Kappumthala, Kaduthuruthy, Thalayolaparambu, Neerpara, Kanjiramattom, Puthenkavu, Puthiyakavu, Thripunithura, Vyttila and M G Road as Super Fast service.

Along with application for renewal of permit the permit holder has also submitted an application for issuing temporary permit U/S 87(1) C of MV Act.

The initial permit was issued in the year 1998 as **LSOS**. The permit was converted into Super Fast and Renewal of Permit was granted for a period of 5 years by the RTA on 21.07.2012 and the permit was valid till 25.06.2016. The application for renewal of permit was submitted in time and along with that an application for variation of permit as LSOS was submitted on 10.06.2016 which was considered by the RTA in its sitting held on 01.09.2016 and adjourned for want of concurrence from RTA Ernakulam and Idukki. This permit is issued prior to **14.07.2009** and is a saved one.

The permit holder has submitted an application for renewing the permit from 26.06.2021 notwithstanding the pending renewal from 26.06.2016 and requested to condone the delay in filing the permit renewal application.

This authority considered the application and verified the records in detail.

The arguments submitted by representatives of STU and objectors were also heard and considered.

The representatives of STU submitted that granting renewal on the above application will be tantamount to violation of the Clauses of the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP(C) No.10563 of 2017.

On examining the matter in detail the following facts are revealed:

a) At present the permit is a Super Fast service i.e, it falls under the category of super class.

b) As per KMV Rule 2 (uc) a Super Fast service can only be operated by STU.

c) The permit has not been varied as LSOS.

d) As per KMV Rule 2 (oa) an Ordinary Limited Stop Service means a service , which is operated on a route having a distance not exceeding 140 kms.

On the above facts, the application of the renewal of permit is hereby adjourned and variations of conditions of permit for converting the class of permit as LSOS is **allowed partially** with direction to the applicant to submit a modified application for variations of conditions of permit to limit the route length below 140 kms.

On the above direction and in compliance of the judgment in WP (C) No.35556/2022, Secretary RTA is directed to grant temporary permit as applied for subject to settlement of timings as LSOS.

Item No.57

Heard the learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is a belated application for renewal of regular permit of the Stage Carriage **KL-34-C-6687** on the route **ARUNAPURAM-THULAPPALLY** via **Pala, Ponkunnam, 26th Mile, Erumeli, Mukkoottuthara** as **Ordinary** service for a period of 5 years from the date of expiry. This permit is issued prior to **14.07.2009** and is a saved one.

This authority considered the application and verified the records in detail. The delay in submitting the application for renewal of regular permit is condoned and the permit renewal **granted** for a further period of 5 years from the date of expiry, subject to the clearance of Govt. dues, submission of Current records and production of No Objection Certificate from the financier, if applicable.

Item No.58

Heard the learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for renewal of regular permit of the Stage Carriage **KL-53-D-7963** on the route **ERATTUPETTA-MANIMALA-PANAMATTAM** via, Pinnackanad, Kalaketty, Anakkallu, Kanjirappally, Panamattom, Kanjirappally, Kurisinkal, Anchilippa, Mannarakkayam, Pazhayidam as **Mofussil** service for a period of 5 years from the date of expiry.

This permit is issued after **14.07.2009** and it is not a saved one.

This authority considered the application and verified the records in detail.

As per the report of the enquiry officer, this is an intra district route having a total distance of 39.2 kms. Out of the total route length of 39.2 kms there is an overlapping of 0.9 kms which is 2.30 % of the total route length which is within the permissible limit as per Clause 5 (c) of the GO (P) No.8/2017/Trans dated:-23.03.2017.

Hence the application for renewal of regular permit is **granted** for a further period of 5 years from the date of expiry if there is no legal impediment, subject to the clearance of Govt. dues, submission of Current records and production of No Objection Certificate from the financier, if applicable.

Item No.59

Heard the learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for renewal of regular permit of the Stage Carriage **KL-34-D-9814** on the route **KOTTAYAM-RANNI** via 14th mile, Kangazha Hospital, Nedumkunnam, Manimala, Placherry as **Mofussil** service for a period of 5 years from the date of expiry.

This permit is issued prior to **14.07.2009** and is a saved one.

The permit holder requested to condone the delay in filing the permit renewal application.

This authority considered the application and verified the records in detail.

The delay in submitting the application for renewal of regular permit is condoned and the permit renewal **granted** for a further period of 5 years from the date of expiry, subject to the clearance of Govt. dues, submission of Current records and production of No Objection Certificate from the financier, if applicable.

Item No.60

Heard the learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for renewal of regular permit of the Stage Carriage **KL-05-X-8744** on the route **Pathinanchil Kadavu – Kottayam** via Thiruvathukkal as **Town** service for a period of 5 years from the date of expiry.

This permit is issued prior to **14.07.2009** and is a saved one.

The permit holder requested to condone the delay in filing the permit renewal application.

This authority considered the application and verified the records in detail.

The delay in submitting the application for renewal of regular permit is condoned and the permit renewal **granted** for a further period of 5 years from the date of expiry, subject to the clearance of Govt. dues, submission of Current records and production of No Objection Certificate from the financier, if applicable.

V. Transfer of Permit**Item No.61**

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.62

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.63

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.64

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.65

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.66

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.67

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.68

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.69

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.70

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.71

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.72

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.73

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.74

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.75

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.76

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.77

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.78

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.79

Heard the learned counsel. On perusal of the written objection received from Kottayam Dist.Private Bus Operator's Co-Op Society Ltd regarding default of the payment due by the transferor, the application for Transfer of Permit is hereby **adjourned** with a direction to the applicant to produce No Objection Certificate from the financier.

Item No.80

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.81

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for **to the successor** subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.82

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.83

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.84

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.85

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.86

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.87

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.88

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.89

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.90

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.91

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.92

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.93

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.94

Heard the learned counsel. On perusal of the written objection received from Kottayam Dist.Private Bus Operator's Co-Op Society Ltd regarding default of the payment due by the transferor the application for Transfer of Permit is hereby **adjourned** with a direction to the applicant to produce No Objection Certificate from the financier.

Item No.95

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.96

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.97

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.98

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.99

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.100

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.101

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.102

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.103

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.104

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.105

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit ***allowed*** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.106

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit ***allowed*** as applied for to the **successor** subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.107

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit ***allowed*** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.108

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit ***allowed*** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.109

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit ***allowed*** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.110

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit ***allowed*** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.111

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit ***allowed*** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.112

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit ***allowed*** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.113

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit ***allowed*** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.114

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.115

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.116

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.117

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.118

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.119

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.120

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.121

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.122

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.123

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.124

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.125

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.126

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.127

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.128

Heard the learned counsel. On perusal of the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court in **WP (C) No.34011 of 2022** and **Order of STAT in M.P No. 993/2022 in M.P No.669/2022 in M.V.A.R.P No.25/2021**, Objection and related records it is noted that the RTA has granted the previous application for transfer of permit to the current permit holder through the decision vide Item No.39 on 23.07.2013. Since the same decision hasn't been revoked or stayed by any order of the Court. Hence the considering the application on its merits and since this is an application for **Transfer of permit by death** of the permit holder to the legal heir, the permit transfer is **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any and also on the condition that the permit transfer is liable for revocation in the event of the final Order pronounced by the tribunal is against the permit transfer.

Item No.129

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.130

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.131

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.132

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.133

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.134

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.135

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.136

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.137

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.138

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.139

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.140

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit ***allowed*** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.141

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit ***allowed*** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.142

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit ***allowed*** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.143

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit ***allowed*** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Item No.144

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit ***allowed*** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

VI. For Ratification**Item No.145**

Surrender of Permits ***accepted*** and ***ratified***.

Permit Variation For Ratification

The decision of the RTA granting variations of conditions of permit in respect of the Stage Carriage **KL-33-C-5112** on the route Manimala - Changanassery through circulation is hereby ***ratified***.

VII. Miscellaneous-Permit Related**Item No.146**

Heard the learned counsel represented the permit holder and objectors. This is initiate final action on alleged permanent trip curtailment of the stage carriage KL-07-CE-4122 issued with regular permit on the route Pala-Perinadu. The issue pertains to the permanent trip curtailment between Kanjirappally and Perunadu.

The enquiry conducted through Joint RTO Kanjirappally has revealed that the stage carriage is permanently curtailing the trips and thus has violated the conditions of permit.

The permit was suspended for a period of three months by the RTA in its sitting held on 19.02.2020. Against the proceedings of the RTA the permit holder filed an appeal before the Hon'ble S.T.A.T in M.V.A.A No.77/2020 which directed the permit holder to operate the service on the entire route.

Thus on perusal of the enquiry report and connected reports its clear that the permit holder deliberately violated the Statutory orders of both the STAT and directions of this authority.

We are of the opinion that before cancelling the permit it will be prudent to bring the matter to the notice of Hon'ble Tribunal and subject to the final order in M.V.A.A No.77/2020 take action on Permit.

Along with that the Secretary RTA is directed to

a) Strictly enforce and ensure that the vehicle conducts service on the entire route through Joint RTO, Kanjirappally.

Hence the item is **adjourned** for a decision subject to the final order of the Hon'ble Tribunal in M.V.A.A No.77/2020.

Item No.147

Heard the learned counsel represented the permit holder, representatives of STU and objectors.

This is to consider the cancellation of the regular permit in respect of S/C KL-06-H-1291 (Pre:-KL-34-D-1033) covered by regular permit on the route Kumily-Ernakulam as Super Fast.

The regular permit in respect of the vehicle was granted by the RTA the year 16.09.2011 on the basis of the order of STAT in MVAA No.171/2011. The regular permit was issued in the year 2013 and had validity upto 07.03.2018.

Hence based on the date of issuance of regular permit by the RTA permit is not a saved one.

On perusal of the connected file in detail its noticed that the representatives of STU had produced the Judgment of Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in R.P No.258/13 in WP (C) No.3217/2012 and requested this authority to cancel the permit by invoking provisions U/S 103 of MV Act r/w KMV Rule 242. On the basis of the request submitted by the STU the matter was placed before the RTA in its sitting held on 24.03.2015 vide Item No.145 and adjourned for seeking legal opinion from the Advocate General pertaining to Cancellation of permit.

The renewal application was submitted on time and in the light of GO(P) No. 73/2013 dated 16.07.2013 the permit holder was directed to submit application for varying the permit as LSOS but the direction hasn't been complied with by the permit holder.

Now as per the records available the vehicle is now conducting service under the strength of temporary permit issued U/S 214(2) of MV Act as per the order of Hon'ble STAT in M.P No.437/2022 in M.V.A.A No.96/2022.

On the above facts the following facts are revealed:

- a) The permit is issued after 14.07.2009 and is not a saved one.
- b) Since the class of permit is Super Fast it falls under the category of Super Class service. The permit has not been varied as LSOS as per records.
- c) As per KMV Rule 2 (uc) a Super Fast service can only be operated by STU.

d) As per KMV Rule 2 (oa) an Ordinary Limited Stop Service means a service , which is operated on a route having a distance not exceeding 140 kms.

e) In the instant case here the total length of the route is 168 kms. Even if the permit is varied as LSOS then the route length has to be limited to 140 kms.

On the above facts we are of the view that the permit is liable for cancellation.

Thus the Secretary is instructed to

a) seek a legal opinion from the Advocate General on the legal grounds for proceeding with the permit cancellation.

b) file an OP(C) before the High Court of Kerala against the order of the STAT in M.P No.437/2022 in M.V.A.A No.96/2022.

c) after obtaining the legal opinion place the matter before this authority.

Hence the decision on the item is ***adjourned.***

VIII. Miscellaneous-Others

Item No.148

Heard.

This is to consider the request from the Secretary, Velloor Grama Panchayath to extend the permit of stage carriages to Velloor Bus stand. The arguments for and against the request was considered.

The main argument was against the width of the road leading to the bus stand. This authority is of the opinion that the issue can be resolved at regional level in consultation with the stake holders, local self government authorities.

Not with standing the fact I hereby grant a general extension of permits to all buses terminating at Velloor to the newly constructed bus stand.

Departmental Items

Departmental Item No.1

In view of the increasing complaints regarding non-adherence to timings by the stage carriages the Secretary, RTA is directed to take further steps in this regard.

Departmental Item No.2

Heard.

This is to consider the request of the Kumarakom Grama Panchayath committee to grant temporary extension of the stage carriage services to Konchumada and Attipeedika to mitigate the difficulties in the light of Konathattu bridge construction work at Kumarakom on the Kottayam-Cherthala route.

This authority considered the representations submitted in detail.

As per the request submitted this authority hereby grant temporary extension to stage carriages coming from Cherthala and Vaikom to Attipeedika and Konchumada respectively in the existing time frame till the completion of bridge construction work.

Departmental Item No.3

Ratified.

Departmental Item No.4**Supplimentary Item No.1**

Heard the learned counsel. Transfer of permit **allowed** as applied for subject to the production of no objection certificate from the financier, if applicable and clearance of Govt. dues, if any.

Supplimentary Item No.2

Heard the learned counsel.

This is to address the matter pertaining to pathetic condition of the comfort stations in the bus stands situated under the jurisdiction of this authority.

After hearing the submissions made before this authority I direct the Secretary to address the issue in consultation with the concerned authorities.

Departmental Item No.5

Erratum Published separately.

Departmental Item No.6

To be fixed later.

Sd/-

Dr. P K Jayasree IAS
District Collector and
Chairperson RTA Kottayam

Sd/-

Sri.Shaji Madhavan
Deputy Transport Commissioner (CZ-II)
Member, RTA

Erratum of meeting of the Regional Transport Authority, Kottayam held on 29.11.2022

1. In Item No.12 in the proposed timings the arrival and departure timings at 9.53 am and 10.13 am is to tabulated under Mundakayam instead of Elamkadu.

Proposed timings as published in agenda

Elamkadu		Mundakayam		504 Colony	Kuzhimavu		Erumely		Pampavalley	
A	D	A	D	P	A	D	A	D	A	D
	7.50 am	8.25	8.30 (via Madukka)		9.08					
9.53				9.23		9.10				
	10.13						10.46			
		11.28						10.55		
			11.42 (via Pulikunnu)				12.15			
		1.18						12.45		
			1.48 (via Madukka)		2.26 (Pass)				2.46	
		4.38			4.00 (Pass)					3.40
			4.55 (via Madukka)		5.33					
		6.26	(via Madukka)			5.48				
7.32 (Halt)			6.57							

Proposed timings corrected

Elamkadu		Mundakayam		504 Colony	Kuzhimavu		Erumely		Pampavalley	
A	D	A	D	P	A	D	A	D	A	D
	7.50 am	8.25	8.30 (via Madukka)		9.08					
		9.53		9.23		9.10				
			10.13 (via Pulikunnu)				10.46			
		11.28						10.55		
			11.42 (via Pulikunnu)				12.15			
		1.18						12.45		
			1.48 (via Madukka)		2.26 (Pass)				2.46	
		4.38			4.00 (Pass)					3.40
			4.55 (via Madukka)		5.33					
		6.26	(via Madukka)			5.48				
7.32 (Halt)			6.57							

2. In Item No.19 in the proposed timings one of the intermediate points should be read as Puthuppally Pally instead of Puthuppally.

Proposed timings as published in agenda

Malikakadavu		Njaliakuzhy	<u>Puthuppally</u>			Manarcad			Ettumanoor	
A	D	P	A	P	D	A	P	D	A	D
	7.44	8.07		8.19			8.32		9.07	
			10.28				10.15			9.40
					10.38		10.51		11.26	
			12.38				12.25			11.50
					12.50		1.03		1.37	
						2.35				2.00
								2.50	3.25	
			4.48				4.35			4.00
					5.02		5.15		5.50	
8.16 (Halt)		7.53		7.38			7.25			6.40

Proposed timings corrected

Malikakadavu		Njaliakuzhy	Puthuppally Pally			Manarcad			Ettumanoor	
A	D	P	A	P	D	A	P	D	A	D
	7.44	8.07		8.19			8.32		9.07	
			10.28				10.15			9.40
					10.38		10.51		11.26	
			12.38				12.25			11.50
					12.50		1.03		1.37	
						2.35				2.00
								2.50	3.25	
			4.48				4.35			4.00
					5.02		5.15		5.50	
8.16 (Halt)		7.53		7.38			7.25			6.40

3. In Item No.28 in the existing and proposed timings halting termini in the proposed timings altered as Kodungoor instead of Pala.

Proposed timings as published in the agenda

Kodungoor		Pala	
A	D	A	D
07.20			06.20 AM
	07.50	08.50	
10.00			09.00
	10.15	11.15	
01.00			12.00
	01.40	02.40	
03.50			02.50
	05.00	06.00 PM(Halt)	

Proposed timings corrected by changing termini

Pala		Kodungoor	
A	D	A	D
07.20			06.20 AM
	07.50	08.50	
10.00			09.00
	10.15	11.15	
01.00			12.00
	01.40	02.40	
03.50			02.50
	05.00	06.00 PM(Halt)	

4. In Item No.30 in the proposed timings the time of halt at Kottayam as 9.05 pm is not entered in the agenda published.

Proposed Timings as published in agenda

Kottayam		Pala			Neeloor	
A	D	A	P	D	A	D
	06.54 AM		08.04		08.44	
10.40			09.30			08.50
	11.34		12.44		01.24	
04.20			03.10			02.30
	04.40	05.50				
				07.55		

Proposed Timings corrected

Kottayam		Pala			Neeloor	
A	D	A	P	D	A	D
	06.54 AM		08.04		08.44	
10.40			09.30			08.50
	11.34		12.44		01.24	
04.20			03.10			02.30
	04.40	05.50				
				07.55		
9.05 pm (Halt)						

5. In Item No.38 in the proposed timings the passing at Edakunnam is erroneously entered in the agenda published. The corrected proposed timings are mentioned below. Also in the notes in the second para to be read as extension of route portion from Edakunnam to Inchiyani.

Kallam		Erattupetta			Kanjirappally		Edakunnam	Inchiyani	
A	D	A	P	D	A	D	P	A	D
						5.50 am	<u>6.10</u>	6.23	
					7.05		<u>6.45</u>		6.32
8.08			7.50			7.10			
	8.49		9.07		9.47				
		10.46				10.06			
				12.20	1.00				
		2.32				1.52			
				2.40	3.20				
		4.27				3.47			
				4.35	5.15	5.35	5.55	6.08	
					6.43		6.23		6.10
		8.10				7.30			
				8.50	9.30 pm (Halt)				

6. In Item No.47 in the notes the Writ Petition No. is to be read as WP (C) No.20077/2022 instead of WP (C) No.2077/2022.

8. In Item No.54 applicants name to be read as Sri.Johny Augusthy, Kannampallil House, Elikulam P O, Kottayam.

9. In Item No.73 2nd applicants name to be read as Sri.Jomon Gopi, Chenkottayil House, Perumpaikadu, Thellakom P O, Kottayam.

10. In Item No.144 the route of the stage carriage is to be read as Kottayam-Njaliakuzhy instead of Kainady-Njaliakuzhy.

11.In Item No.147 in the notes of the agenda second last sentence reads thus:

The permit was not a saved one since it was issued after 14.07.2009 instead of issued before 14.07.2009.

Sd/-

**Secretary
RTA Kottayam**