

**DECISION OF REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY
KOZHICODE DATED 05.09.2024**

PRESENT

1. **Sri. Snehil Kumar Singh IAS, District Collector And Chairman, Regional Transport Authority, Kozhikode.**
2. **Sri. Nidhinraj.P IPS, Superintendent of Police, Kozhikode (Rural) And Member of Regional Transport Authority, Kozhikode.**
3. **Sri. C.V.M.Sharief, Deputy Transport Commissioner, North Zone, Kozhikode And Member of Regional Transport Authority, Kozhikode**

ITEM NO.1

Heard. This is an application to consider the request for grant of concurrence for a fresh regular permit to operate on the route Karuvarakundu-Kozhikode Palayam Bus Stand (Via) Kalikavu, Vaniyambalam, Wandoor, Thiruvalli, Edavanna, Pannippara, Areekkodu, Aalikkal, Perumkadavu Bridge, Kuniyil, Kavilada, Cheruvadi, Chulikkaparambu, Mavoor, Peruvayal and Medical College Hospital and (Via) Elamaram Bridge and Edavannappara as Ordinary Service.

On verification of the enquiry report the following facts to be verified

1. In the route sketch the enquiry officer did not mention whether the route passes through the newly constructed bridge, Elamaram Palam.
2. Frequency of the services on the applied route is not submitted by the field officer.

Hence Secretary RTA is directed to conduct a specific enquiry on the above facts and place before next RTA. Hence **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.2

Heard. This is an application to consider the request for grant of concurrence for a fresh regular permit to operate on the route Ramanattukara- Mele Puthukkode which include the portion Ramanattukara- Parammal in Kozhikode.

Enquiry officer reported that portion of the route in Kozhikkode District is from Ramanattukara to Parammal (1.7 Kms). On this stretch, there is no virgin portion. There is no objectionable overlapping on the notified sector on the above portion in this district. Concurrence for the above portion is not objectionable as per GO(P) No. 42/2009/Tran dtd 14/7/2009 modified as per G.O. (P) No. 13/2023/TRANS dtd 03.5.2023(SRO No.537/2023)

Hence concurrence **granted** subject to stipulations in the notification G.O. (P) No. 13/2023/TRANS dtd 03.5.2023(SRO No.537/2023)

ITEM NO.3

Heard. This is an application to consider the request for grant of concurrence for a fresh regular permit to operate on the route Cheekkodu Higher Secondary School-Ramanattukara via Edavannappara Bus Stand, Vazhakkad, Mundumuzhi, Oorkadavu, Aakkode, Punchappadam, Karad, Azhinhilam and Parammal with halting place at Punchapadam as mofussil service.

This application was considered by this authority on 27.02.2024 vide item no 3 and adjourned to clarify the exact distance of the route falling under this jurisdiction with intermediate points and route length from the Secretary RTA, Malappuram. Secretary RTA, Malappuram clarified that the exact distance of the route falling under the jurisdiction of RTA Kozhikode is 1.9 km (from Parammal to Ramanattukara). The intermediate point between Parammal and Ramanattukara is Bank Road and Bank Road Junction. There is no virgin portion.

Hence concurrence **granted** subject to stipulations in the notification G.O. (P) No. 13/2023/TRANS dtd 03.5.2023(SRO No.537/2023).

ITEM NO.4

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit on the intra district route (Vehicle number not furnished) to operate on the route Kadalundi Railway Station-Feroke Bus Stand(via) Kadalundi Railway Gate-Chaliyam Angadi-Karuvanthuruthi.

1.Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars thereof before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

2.During the meeting entire private stage carriages operators on the applied route has raised severe objection against this proposal stating that the proposed route is highly saturated and well served and may lead to unhealthy competition between the enroute operators and traffic congestion, which in turn will harmfully affect the travelling public

as well as other road users. Hence Secretary RTA is directed to obtain the frequency of stage carriages services on the applied sector.

For the compliance of the above; decision of the above item is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.5

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit on the intra district route Feroke Bus Stand- Kadalundi Railway Station Via Karuvanthiruthi, Chaliyam Angadi, Kadalundi Railway Gate .

1.Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1)of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S.A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle "that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any ,for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application.The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2)of Motor Vehicles Act.

2.During the meeting entire private stage carriages operators on the applied route raised severe objections against this proposal stating that proposed route is highly saturated and well served and may lead to unhealthy competition between the en route operators and traffic congestion, which in turn will harmfully affect the travelling public as well as other road users.Hence Secretary RTA is directed to obtain the frequency of stage carriages services on the applied sector. .

For the compliance of the above; decision of the above item is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.6

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit on the inter district route The Edavannappara- Koolimadu Bridge- Mukkam Via Nayarkuzhi School, Erimala, Kalanthode, Manassery, Agasthianmuzhi..

1.Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1)of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S.A

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permits.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

2. The field officer reported that the proposed route is inter district and portion of the route lies in Malappuram district (3 kms from Koolimadu Bridge- Edavannappara).

Hence Secretary RTA is directed to seek concurrence from Sister RTA Malappuram. .

For the compliance of the above; decision of the above item is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO 7

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit on the intra district route Mavoor -Koduvally-Via Vellalasseri, REC/Kattangal, Thalapperumanna Bridge, Kareettiparamba.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.SA.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

2.The enquiry officer reported that the proposed KODUVALLY- MAVOOR Via Kareettiparamba, REC, Vellalasseri route connects Koduvally, which is a major town on the Wayanad Road with REC/ Kattangal, a major educational centre on the Kozhikode-Mukkam Road and with Mavoor, a prominent town on the Areacode- Edavanna route. The enquiry officer has not specified the notified route included in the applied sector. This authority scrutinized the application, connected reports and the agenda. The report of the field officer is not sufficient to ascertain the suitability of the application.

Hence Secretary RTA is directed to obtain the detailed report including notified route and the frequency of stage carriages services on the applied sector.

For the compliance of the above; decision of the above item is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.8

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit on the intra district route Narikkuni -Kalarikkandi - Kattangal- Mukkam Via Thazhe Padanilam-Kalarikkandi-Thalapperumanna-Agastian Muzhi.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

2.This authority scrutinized the application, connected reports and the agenda. The report of the field officer is not sufficient to ascertain the suitability of the application. Hence Secretary RTA is directed to obtain the frequency of stage carriages services on the applied sector.

For the compliance of the above; decision of the above item is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.9

Heard. This is an application for a fresh regular Stage Carriage permit to operate on the intra district route NARIKKUNI- MAVOOR- MUKKAM Via Mele Padanilam, ThazhePadanilam, Kalarikkandi, Eranhikoth, Thalapperumanna, Kattangal, Vellalassery and Mavoor in the surrender vacancy of KL-56-8235.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

2. This authority scrutinized the application, connected reports and the agenda. The report of the field officer is not sufficient to ascertain the suitability of the application. Hence Secretary RTA is directed to obtain the frequency of stage carriages services on the applied sector.

For the compliance of the above; decision of the above item is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.10

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit to operate on the intra district route Ezhikulam- Iyyad- Balusseri- Narikkuni in the surrender vacancy of KL-08-BD-1795. . This application was considered by this authority on 27.02.2024 vide item no 36 and adjourned to obtain the frequency of services on the applied route

In the detailed report of field officer the frequency of other stage carriage services on the applied route is not mentioned.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

2. This authority scrutinized the application, connected reports and the agenda, The detailed report submitted by the field officer is not specific and not submitted the entire frequency of stage carriage services on the applied route. Hence Secretary RTA is directed to obtain the entire route frequency of services on the applied route.

For the compliance of the above; decision of the above item is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.11

Heard. This is an application for a fresh regular Stage Carriage permit to operate on the intra district route Odumbra- Kunnathpalam – Medical College Via Iringallur, Hilite Mall, Athani, MLA Road, Ummalathur, Velliparamba.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars

there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

2. This authority scrutinized the application, connected reports and the agenda. The report of the field officer is not sufficient to ascertain the suitability of the application. Hence Secretary RTA is directed to obtain the frequency of stage carriage services on the applied sector and specify whether the route applied for falls under City permit category. For the compliance of the above; decision of the above item is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.12

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit on the intra district route Nellipoil- Mukkam -Thamarassery- Perambra Via Punnakkal, Thiruvambady, Agasthiamuzhi, Omassery, Koodathai, Poonoor, Balussery, Koottalida, Koorachundu.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. The applicant has not offered a ready vehicle.

2. During the hearing, severe objections were received from existing operators against this proposal. On verification of the proposal timings, the majority trips are seen concentrated on Koorachundu - Perambra via Balussery sector, which is a well served sector. Any introduction of a service may lead to unhealthy competition between the enroute operators and traffic congestion, which in turn will harmfully affect the travelling public as well as other road users.

For the above reasons, including the road safety aspects, the above application for fresh permit is **rejected**.

ITEM NO.13

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit on the inter district route Areekode- Mavoor- Medical college Hospital- Kozhikode Via Eranhimavu, Koolimadu Palam, Mappuram, Elamaram Palam, Velliparamba.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application.

2. The field officer reported that the portion of route from Areekode- Eranhimavu= 6.6 km, Koolimadu Palam to Elamaram Palam= 2 km, lies in Malappuram district..

This authority scrutinized the application, connected reports and the agenda. The report of the field officer is not sufficient to ascertain the suitability of the application. The nature of the roads and detailed sketch of city portion is not specified in the route sketch.

Hence Secretary RTA is directed

1. To seek concurrence from Sister RTA Malappuram
2. To conduct a detailed enquiry regarding frequency of services on the applied route and nature of the roads in city limit with detailed route sketch.
3. The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars thereof before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act. For the compliance of the above; decision of the above item is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.14

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit on the intra district route Adivaram-Mukkam- Thiruvambadi- Pulloorambara Via Kaithapoil, Kannothe, Kodenchery, murampathy, Thampalamanna, Thiruvambady, Thondinmmal and Irumbakam, Athippara, Manjuvayal, Nellipoil, Pulikkayam.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport

vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

2.This authority scrutinized the application, connected reports and the agenda. The report of the field officer is not sufficient to ascertain the suitability of the application. Hence Secretary RTA is directed to obtain the detailed report including the frequency of stage carriages services on the applied sector.

For the compliance of the above; decision of the above item is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.15

Perused the judgment. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit on the intra district route Parappur-Kozhikode (Palayam Stand)(via) Edavannapara, Oorkkadavu, Pallithazham, Kuranjodathpalam, Poovattuparambu and Medical College as Mofussil Service in the lapsed vacancy of S/C KL-11-R-3245, which is considered and rejected by RTA dated 27.02.2024 vide item no.6.The applicant challenged the above decision before Hon'ble STAT and State Transport Appellate Tribunal Ernakulam in its order in, M.P No.1528/2024 in M.V.A.A No.158/2024 dated 29.06.2024_directed to seek concurrence of the RTA Malappuram

Reconsidered the application on the basis of Hon'ble STAT.

1.The route is inter district. Secretary RTA,Kozhikode is directed to seek concurrence of the RTA Malappuram ,for the portion falling within the jurisdiction of the RTA Malappuram.

2. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this

authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

For the compliance of the above reasons the decision of this application is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.16

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit on the intra district route Kadalundi – Chaliyam – Feroke – Murukkallingal – Farooq College (Via) Karuvanthiruthy Bridge, Madathil Padam, Rob, Puttekkad Road Jn, I.O.C. E.S.I. Feroke, Chanthakkadavu, Taluk Hospital, Feroke Chunkam, Chaliyam GLP School Jn, Kunnath Padi, Mannur Rail, Prabodhini, Mannur Valavu, TMH as Mofussil Service. This application was considered by this authority dated 27.02.2024 vide item 34 and adjourned .

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A.

The applicant has offered a “suitable vehicle” that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. The applicant has not offered a ready vehicle so far.

2 During the hearing, several objections received against this proposal. The major objections are grant of this permit will create unhealthy competition on the Feroke sector and since the Feroke Bus stand is over crowded with stage carriages, there is no scope of further issue of permit in this sector.

This authority scrutinized the application, connected reports and the agenda. It is found that, grant of this application will unsettle the present state of equilibrium of

timings prevailing among the stage carriage operators and result in over speeding and traffic congestion, which in turn will harmfully affect the travelling public as well as other road users.

For the above reasons, application for fresh permit is **rejected**.

ITEM NO.17

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit on the intra district route Koduvally Bus Stand- Elettil Vattoli (via Narikkuni Road Jn- East Kizhakkoth-Poovathodika- Parakunnu-Aavilora- Katharammal-MJ higher Secondary School).

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

2 During the hearing , it is submitted that the width of the bridge on the Koduvally - Vattoli route situated near Avilora Juma Masjid. is not sufficient to conduct stage carriage operation through this bridge and fitness certificate to be obtained from the authorities, Hence Secretary RTA is directed to obtain fitness certificate of road from the PWD authorities regarding the suitability for stage carriage operation and place before next RTA..

Hence decision of this application is **adjourned** for compliance of (1) and (2).

ITEM NO.18

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit on the intra district route Mukkam- Pulparamba Via Mavoor, Manassery, Pazhoor, Koolimasdu, Cheruvady, Kodyathoor, Karassery in the Surrender Vacancy of the Permit KL-11-BB-1006.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport

vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. No ready vehicle offered by the applicant

2. During the hearing, severe objections in respect of application are received. On perusal of application and connected records, this authority feels that the timing proposed is different from the surrendered vehicle timing, and granting this permit will unsettle the present state of equilibrium of timings prevailing among the stage carriage operators in the well served sectors of Mukkam-Pulparamba region and may lead to unhealthy competition between the en route operators and traffic congestion, which in turn will harmfully affect the travelling public as well as other road users.

Hence the application for fresh permit is **rejected**.

ITEM NO.19

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit on the intra district route Kunnamangalam-Narikkuni-Vattoli-Thamarassery-Balusseri-Kakkodi Via Padanilam, Madavoor, Elettai Vattoli, Ponoor, Thachampoyil, Thamarassery, Chungam, Punnassery, Karakkunnath, Soopi Road, Nanmanda, Nanmanda-14, 10th Mile, Payambra Road, Kuruvattoor and Muttoli.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and

not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act. Applicant has not offered a ready vehicle so far.

2. During the hearing, several objections including KSRTC received against the application, regarding the overlapping of the notified route. The route length is 51.8Km, out of which 5.6km (From Kunnamangalam to Padanilam 4.1km and Thamarassery chungam to Thamarassery is 1.5 Km) passing through the notified route, Kozhikode-Manathavady vide notification number GO(P) 13/2023/Trans/dated 3.5.2023 approved scheme. As per 5(c) of the notification, overlapping permissible is only 5km or 5% of the route length, whichever is less. In this case, overlapping exceeds the permissible limit and violates the conditions of Scheme

Hence the application for fresh permit is **rejected**.

ITEM NO.20

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit on the intra district route Koduvally-Kattangal Via High School Road, Karoonhi, Eranhikoth, Chenoth, Valiyapoil, Company Mukku.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

2 During the hearing, it is pointed out that the proposed route contains virgin portion. But the field officer has not mentioned the virgin portion included in the application, in his report. Hence Secretary RTA is directed to obtain the specific report including virgin portion and type of vehicle suitable for the applied route.

Hence decision of this application is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.21

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit on the inter district route Koolimadu Bridge-Edavannappara-Mukkam Via Nayarkuzhi School, Erimala, Kalanthode, Manassery, Agasthianmuzhi.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars thereof before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

2 The enquiry officer reported that the portion Koolimadu Bridge- Edavannappara lies in Malappuram district, having a distance of 3 km. Hence Secretary RTA is directed to seek concurrence from Sister RTA Malappuram.

Hence decision of this application is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.22

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit on the inter district route Kozhikode- Areacode Via Medical College, Mavoor, Elamaram Palam, Edavannappara, Vavoor, Mamatha Jn.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any

public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application.

The enquiry officer reported that the portion Elamaram Palam – Areakode lies in Malappuram district having a distance of 13 km.

Hence Secretary RTA is directed to

- a) seek concurrence from Sister RTA Malappuram.
- b) obtain specific report including nature of the city limit with detailed sketch in City portion from Motor Vehicle Inspector of RTO, Kozhikode.
- c) The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars thereof before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

Hence decision of this application is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.23

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit on the intra district route Ramanattukara-Feroke-Chaliyam Ferry-Murukkallingal Via Perumukham Road Junction, Perumukham, Pullikkadavu, Kallampara, Nalloor School, Karuvanthiruthi, Chaliyam, Kadalundi, TMH Bypass, Prabodhini, Mannoor, and Murukkallingal(via)Mannoor Rail as Moffusil Service.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. The applicant has not offered a ready vehicle

2. During the hearing, several objections received against this proposal ,stating that Feroke bus stand is already congested with buses waiting to operate next trip. Track and space is not available in Feroke Bus stand to operate new bus services.

On verification of report,agenda and connected records,it is noticed that the trips are concentrated on the well served sectors of Ramanattukara and Feroke and granting this permit will unsettle the present state of equilibrium of timings prevailing among the stage carriage operators in the well served sectors of Ramanattukara-feroke region and may lead to unhealthy competition between the enroute operators and traffic congestion, which in turn will harmfully affect the travelling public as well as other road users.

Hence the application for fresh permit is **rejected**.

ITEM NO.24

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit on the intra district route FEROKE – ODUMBRA – MEDICAL COLLEGE (via) Cheruvannur, Pantheerankavu, Puthoormadam, Payyadimeethal, Athani, MLA Road, Kovur, Chevayur, Madathil Mukku, Methottuthazham, Kuttiyilthazham , Kulangarapeedika, Pokkunnu, Mathara, Iringallur and one round trip Feroke to Chaliyam as Mofussil Service in the lapsed vacancy of permit No. KL1111/130/2001 with the same timings of s/c KL10Q-9429.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A.

The applicant has offered a “suitable vehicle” that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2)of Motor Vehicles Act.

Hence **Adjourned**.

ITEM NO.25

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit on the intra district route Kuttikkattoor- Mavoor – Kozhikode Palayam via Cherooppa, Pallithazham, Parammal, Pantheerankav, Koolithara (Lulu) ,Kalluthan Kadav, Baby Memorial Hospital, New Bus Stand, CPO, Anni hall Road, Railway and Mooriyad.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. Applicant not offered a ready vehicle.

2. In the meeting several objections received against this application stating that granting of this application will create unhealthy competition between the enroute operators and leads to accidents.

On verification of the report, agenda, objections and connected records the major portion of the applied route is concentrated in City area. The granting of this application will unsettle the present state of equilibrium of timings prevailing among stage carriage operators in the well served sectors of Mavoor-Kozhikode creating unhealthy competition between the enroute operators and leads to traffic congestion which in turn will harmfully affect the travelling public as well as other road users. Hence taking the account on the road safety concerns, The above application for fresh regular stage carriage permit is **rejected**.

ITEM NO.26

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit on the inter district route Beypore – Parappanangadi (via) BC Road, Cheruvannur Junction, Cheruvannur, Feroke Bus Stand, Feroke E.S.I., Puttekkad Road Junction, R.O.B. West Nallur, Yatheemkhana, Karuvanthiruthy, Chaliyam, touching Chaliyam Ferry, Kadalundi Kadavu Bridge, Aanangadi and Chettipadi (without touching Vallikkunnu Railway Station) and halting place at Chaliyam Ferry as Mofussil Service.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport

vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

2.The field officer reported that the portion from Kadalundi Kadavu Palam to Parappanagadi Bus stand 9.5 Km lies in Malappuram district.Hence Secretary RTA is directed to seek concurrence from Sister RTA Malappuram.

Hence decision of this application is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.27

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit on the inter district route BEYPORE - PARAPPANANGADI (via) BC Road, Cheruvannur Junction, Cheruvannur, Feroke Bus Stand, Feroke E.S.I., Puttekkad Road Junction, R.O.B. West Nallur, Yatheemkhana, Karuvanthiruthy, Chaliyam, touching Chaliyam Ferry, Kadalundi Kadavu Bridge, Aanangadi and Chettipadi (without touching Vallikkunnu Railway Station) and halting place at Chaliyam Ferry as Mofussil Service.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and

not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

2. The field officer reported that the portion from Kadalundi Kadavu Palam to Parappanagadi Bus stand 9.5 Km lies in Malappuram district. Hence Secretary RTA is directed to seek concurrence from Sister RTA Malappuram.

Hence decision of this application is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.28

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit on the intra district route Guruvayurappan College – Pullaloor (via) Kulangara Peedika, Kuttiyl Thazham, Methottuthazham, Madathil Mukku, Chevayur, Medical College Hospital, Palakkottu Vayal, Kalaandi Thazham, Moozhikkal, Cheruvatta, Parambil Bazaar, Poloor Angadi, and Paymbra as Mofussil service.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A.

The applicant has offered a “suitable vehicle” that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

2 In the report of field officer, city portion and notified area between Moozhikal and Parambil bazaar are not mentioned. Hence Secretary RTA is directed to obtain specific report from the field officer for the above facts.

Hence decision of this application is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.29

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit on the intra district route Feroke – Ramanattukara touching Chaliyam Ferry and Murukkallingal (via) Karuvanthiruthy, Chaliyam, Kadalundi, TMH Bypass, Prabodhini, Mannur, Kallampara, Pullikkadavu and Perumugham and Nallur School and Murukkallingal via. Mannur Rail and halt at Feroke Taluk Hospital via. Chanthakkadavu as Mofussil Service.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. The applicant has not offered a ready vehicle.

2. During the hearing, several objections were received against this proposal ,stating that the Feroke bus stand is already congested with buses waiting to operate next trip. Track and space is not available in Feroke Bus stand to operate new bus services.

On verification of report,agenda and connected records,it is noticed that the trips are concentrated on the well served sectors of Ramanattukara and Feroke and granting this permit will unsettle the present state of equilibrium of timings prevailing among the stage carriage operators in the well served sectors of Ramanattukara-feroke region and may lead to unhealthy competition between the enroute operators and traffic congestion, which in turn will harmfully affect the travelling public as well as other road users.

Hence the application for fresh permit is **rejected**.

ITEM NO.30

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit on the intra district route Kodenchery-Omassery-Thamarassery-Engapuzha-Thiruvambady Via Kalathramedu,St.Maries School Junction, Chundakkunnu, Manippal, Venappara, Kuppayakkode, Kannothe, Markaz Knowledge City, Kaithappoyil, Chamundi Junction,NooramThode,Chembu Kadavu, Poovathichuvadu, Nellippoyil, Meenmutty Junction, Pulikkayam, Maikavu, Koodathayi, Chungam, Thamarassery Puthiya Stand, Shanthi Nagar, Kallurutty, Thmabalamanna, Murampathy as Moffusil Service.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a

motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act. Applicant has not offered a ready vehicle so far.

2. On verification of report, it is not specifically mentioned regarding the objectionable overlapping of notified schemes of KSRTC. Secretary RTA is directed to obtain specific report of scheme violation in the applied route.

Hence decision of this application is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.31

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit on the inter district route Areekode- Mavoor- Edavannappara- Kozhikode Via Eranhimavu, Cheruvadi, Koolimadu Palam, Elamaram Palam, Oorkkadav, Mundumuzhi.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the

ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

2 The enquiry officer reported that the portion from Areecode-Eranjimavu, Koolimadu Palam- Elamaram Palam, Oorkadavu – Edavannapara lies in Malappuram district having a distance of 15.3 km.

Hence Secretary RTA is directed to obtain

a) Concurrence from Sister RTA Malappuram.

b) Specific report including nature of the city limit with a detailed sketch from the Motor Vehicle Inspector of RTO, Kozhikode .

Hence decision of this application is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.32

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit inter district route Medical College- Oorkkadav- Perumanna – Pantheerankav- Kozhikode Via Poovattuparamba, Kayalam , Hilite Mall, Cyber Park, Pottammel, and Mavoor Road

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A.

The applicant has offered a “suitable vehicle” that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. Applicant not offered any ready vehicle.

During the meeting, several severe objections received from existing operators against this proposal. They produced earlier decisions of this authority held on 21.08.2023 and 22.11.2022, 27.02.2024, on the very same route, which were rejected by this authority.

On verification of the proposal timing only single trips are offered to Medical College and two trips to Oorkadavu. The majority trips are concentrated on Perumanna – Kozhikode a highly well served city area. Any introduction of a service may lead to unhealthy competition between the en route operators and traffic congestion, which in turn will harmfully affect the travelling public as well as other road users.

For the above reasons including the road safety aspects, the above application for fresh permit is **rejected**.

ITEM NO.33

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit intra district route Keezhumadu- Kozhikode- Palayam, Puthoor Madom- Kozhikode – Playam, Via Punathil Bazar, Palazhi, Hilite Mall, Cyber Park, Methottu Thazham, Pantheerankav, Nandilath Junction, Stadium Junction, CPO, Mananchira.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. No ready vehicle offered by the applicant

2. In the meeting, several objections raised by enroute operators, stating that the applicant's intention is to operate as city service. On verification of the timings proposed by the applicant, it is noticed that the service is concentrated in the city area and the trips provided to Kizhumad and Puthurmadam is only to overcome the legal restrictions imposed for city permits. While considering the frequency of services, this authority learned that it is not feasible to provide clash free set of timings on this route. Any introduction of a service will lead to unhealthy competition resulting in accidents.

This authority feels that there is no need for a fresh permit on such a highly saturated route at present. **Hence rejected.**

ITEM NO.34

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit intra district route Keezhumadu- Kozhikode- Palayam, Puthoor Madom- Kozhikode – Playam, Palazhi- Kozhikode Palayam Via Punathil Bazar, Hilite Mall, Cyber Park, Methottu Thazham, Pantheerankav, Nandilath Junction, Stadium Junction, CPO, Mananchira.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. No ready vehicle offered by the applicant.

2. In the meeting, several objections raised by enroute operators, stating that the applicant's intention is to operate as city service. On verification of the timings proposed by the applicant, it is noticed that the service is concentrated in the city area and the trips provided to Kizhumad and Puthurmadam is only to overcome the legal restrictions imposed for city permits. While considering the frequency of services, this authority learned that it is not feasible to provide clash free set of timings on this route. Any introduction of a service will lead to unhealthy competition resulting in accidents.

This authority feels that there is no need for a fresh permit on such a highly saturated route at present. Hence **rejected**.

ITEM NO.35

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit intra district route Kozhikode Railway Station- Kattangal-Manasseri Via Mofussil Bus Stand, Kottoli, Nethaji Nagar, Chevarambalam, Iringadanpalli, Kalandithazham, MundickalThazham, kottamparamba, Perinolam, Kurikkathoor, IshtikaBazar, Vayal, MVR, Chulur.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. No ready vehicle offered by the applicant.

2 During the meeting ,several objections received against this proposal.On verification of report,agenda and connected file it is noticed that the majority of trips are concentrated in City portion. This authority learned that it is not feasible to provide clash free set of timings on this route. Any introduction of a service will lead to unhealthy competition resulting in accidents. Hence **rejected**.

ITEM NO.36

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit inter district route Edavannappara-Thiruvambadi-Kaithapoyil (Via Edavannapara-Koolimad new bridge Chennamangalur-Mukkam-Mukkam kadav bridge- Gatumpadi-Thiruvambadi-Thambalamanna- Murampathi-Kodancheri-Kannoth-Knowledge City -Kaithapoyil.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2)of Motor Vehicles Act.

2. The enquiry officer reported that the portion from Koolimad- Edavannapara- lies in Malappuram district having 2.6 km. Secretary RTA is directed to seek concurrence from Sister RTA Malappuram.

Hence decision of this application is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.37

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit inter district route Edavannappara-Thiruvambadi-Kaithapoyil (Via Edavannapara-Koolimad new bridge Chennamangalur-Mukkam-Mukkam kadav bridge- Gatumpadi-Thiruvambadi-Thambalamanna- Murampathi-Kodancheri-Kannoth-Knowledge City -Kaithapoyil.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport

vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

2.The enquiry officer reported that the portion from Koolimad- Edavannapara- lies in Malappuram district having 2.6 km. Secretary RTA is directed to seek concurrence from Sister RTA Malappuram.

Hence decision of this application is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.38

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit inter district route Mukkam-Edavannapara-Areekkodu-Thamarassery(Via Karasseri Jn-Kodiyathur - Cheruvadi-Kavilada-Kuniyil-Edasserikadavu Bridge-Areekode(via)-Perumkadav Bridge-Aalukkal-AsterMIMS Hospital-Thamarassery from Mukkam via-Omassery-Kudukkilummaram Bypass and Karaadi Junction with Mukkam- Pannikodu trips touching from Kavilada as Mofussil Service.

1.Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and

not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

2. The Portion of route from Kavilada to Areekode and Kuniyil to Edavannapara total of 13.2km is lying in Malappuram District. Hence Secretary RTA is directed to obtain seek concurrence from Sister RTA Malappuram.

Hence decision of this application is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.39

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit inter district route Elamaram- Kunnammangalam via Mavoor, Cherooppa, Kuttikkadav, Periyangad as ordinary Service with modified proposed timings.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. No ready vehicle offered by the applicant

2 During the meeting several objection received against this proposal about time clash. On verification of agenda, report and connected records, this authority learnt that it is not feasible to provide clash free set of timings on this route. Any introduction of a service will lead to unhealthy competition resulting in accidents.

This authority feels that there is no need for a fresh permit on such a highly saturated route at present. **Hence rejected.**

ITEM NO.40

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit intra district route Annassery-Kozhikode-Medical College Hospital Via Pattar Palam-Puthiyedatth Thazham-Chelannoor 8/2-Ambalath Kulangara-Kumaraswamy-kakkodi-Muttoli-Thanner Panthal-Vengeri-Thadambattu Thazham-Karaparambu-homeo College-Karaparambu-eranhipalam-Nadakkavu as Moffusil Service in the same lapsed vacancy of S/C KL09N2899.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. No ready vehicle offered by the applicant.

On verification of agenda, report and connected records, it is noticed that the trips are concentrated in well served area. This authority learnt that it is not feasible to provide clash free set of timings on this route. Any introduction of a service will lead to unhealthy completion, resulting in accidents. This authority feels that there is no need for a fresh permit on such a highly saturated route at present. **Hence rejected.**

ITEM NO.41

This is the repetition of Item 34. Considered as Item 34.

ITEM NO.42

This is the repetition of Item 33. Considered as Item 33.

ITEM NO.43

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit intra district route Nayar Kuzhi-Mavoor-Mukkam Via Chittarippilakkil -Kuttikkulam-Arayankode Masjid-South Arayankode-Kidappil Junction-Pulparambu-Chennamangalloor-Kachery-PC Road-Pottassery-Manassery-Agastian Muzhi as Moffusil Service

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

Hence **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.44

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit intra district route Pullurambar-Kombara-Tiruvambadi-Mukkam-Omassery-Tamarassery route via Koodaranji-Kodancherry-Punnakkal.

Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S.A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. No ready vehicle offered by the applicant.

Moreover the proposed route contains more than four termini, and violates the definition of route defined under section 2(38).

Hence application of fresh permit is **rejected**.

ITEM NO.45

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit inter district route Koodaranji-Mukkam-Thamarassery-Areacode-Mavoor Via Manassery-R.E.C-Kattangal-Karamoola-Mukkam Kadavu Palam

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. No ready vehicle offered by the applicant

2 During the meeting several objections including KSRTC received against this proposal for time clash. On verification of agenda, report and connected records, it is noticed the trips are concentrated in well served area. This authority learnt that it is not feasible to provide clash free set of timings on this route. Any introduction of a service will lead to unhealthy competition resulting in accidents. This authority feels that there is no need for a fresh permit on such a highly saturated route at present..Hence **rejected**.

ITEM NO.46

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit intra district route Kadalundi- Chaliyam-Feroke Via. Karuvanthiruthi

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

2. During the meeting entire private stage carriages operators on the applied route raised severe objections against this proposal stating that the proposed route is highly saturated

and well served. Hence Secretary RTA is directed to obtain the frequency of stage carriages services on the applied sector.

For the compliance of the above; decision of the above item is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.47

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit intra district route Feroke- Chaliyam-Kadalundi Via. Karuvanthiruthi.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

2. During the meeting entire private stage arriages operators on the applied route raised severe objections against this proposal stating that the proposed route is highly saturated and well served. Hence Secretary RTA is directed to obtain the frequency of stage carriages services on the applied sector.

For the compliance of the above; decision of the above item is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.48

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit intra district route Feroke College - Paruthipara - Ramanattukara - Chulliparamba - Feroke (via) Feroke Petta, Kodampuzha, Adivaram as Mofussil Service.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this

authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. No ready vehicle offered by the applicant

2. During the meeting, severe objections received against this proposal. On verification of agenda, report and connected records, it is seen that the trips are concentrated in well served area. This authority learnt that it is not feasible to provide clash free set of timings on this route. Any introduction of a service will lead to unhealthy competition resulting in accidents. This authority feels that there is no need for a fresh permit on such a highly saturated route at present. Hence **rejected**.

ITEM NO.49

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit intra district route Feroke- Chaliyam Kadav Via Karuvanthiruthi. Chaliyam.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S.A

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. The applicant has not offered a ready vehicle.

2. During the meeting several objections against this proposal and stating that Feroke bus stand is already congested with buses waiting to operate next trip. Track and space is not available in Feroke Bus stand to operate new bus services

On verification of agenda, report and connected records this authority learned that it is not feasible to provide clash free set of timings on this route. Any introduction of a service will lead to unhealthy competition resulting in accidents. This authority feels that there is no need for a fresh permit on such a highly saturated route at present. Hence **rejected**.

ITEM NO.50

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit inter district route Areacode-Kozhikode- Palalyam- Edavannappara- Thamarassery - Via Cheruvady, Mavoor, Poovattuparamba and ElamaramKadavu Palam, Vavoor, Mukkam- Omassery Thamarassery Chunkam.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

2. In the meeting, several objections raised by enroute operators that the applicant's intention is to operate as city service. On verification of the timings proposed by the applicant, it is noticed that the service is concentrated in the City area. Secretary RTA is directed to conduct a specific enquiry on the above facts with route sketch of City portion in the proposal

3. The enquiry officer reported that the portion from Elamaram Palam- Areacode- lies in Malappuram district having a distance of 20 km. Secretary RTA shall seek concurrence from Sister RTA Malappuram.

Hence decision of this application is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.51

Perused the Judgment . This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit inter district route Thiruvambady-Mukkam-Kodenchery-Adivaram-Nellipoyil via Agastiamuzhi-Thondimmal-Murampathi-Kannoth-Knowledge City-Kaithapoyil-Kattiad Valavu-Irumpakam-Pallipadi-Pullurampara and halt at Thiruvambady as ordinary service which is granted by RTA 04/10/2017 vide item no.9 and timings settled on 23.05.2018.

Heard the applicant. regular permit was granted by RTA Kozhikode in its meeting held on 04.10. 2017 The vehicle produced by that grantee was not in par with the decision taken by STA, fixing the age limit as 8 years for fresh regular permit .Even though temporary

permit was issued in compliance to the direction of honorable High Court in WPC 14095 / 2018, the grantee failed to avail the regular permit granted by RTA.

Now the grantee has submitted the records of SC KL07BH 4261 only on 25.06.2024. Rule 159 (2) KMV Rules, specify that in the event of any applicant failing to produce the certificates of registration within the period of specified (not exceeding 4 months) authority may revoke the sanction of the application. In this case the records produced by the grantee only on 25.06.2024 which is beyond the limit. No evidence to substantiate the delay in producing the records submitted by the grantee. Hence the request to condone the delay is **rejected**. The regular permit granted by this authority on the route Thiruvambadi- Mukkam-Kodanchery- Adivaram-Nellipoyil stands **revoked**.

ITEM NO.52

Heard. This is an application for delay condonation for producing current records for fresh permit application which is granted by RTA dated 27.02.2024 vide item no 7.

Regular permit was granted by RTA Kozhikode in its meeting held on 27.02.2024 vide item 7. The applicant was directed to produce the current records within one month from the date of communication of decision, failing which sanction will be revoked without further notice. Proceedings issued on 14.05.2024. On 11.06.2024, the applicant filed an application and requested to grant further time for production of current records.

Rule 159 (2) KMV Rules, specify that in the event of any applicant failing to produce the certificate of registration within the period specified (not exceeding 4 months), authority may revoke the sanction of the application. In this case applicant failed to produce records within 13.09.2024. Hence the request to condone the delay is **rejected**. The regular permit granted by this authority on the route Pavangad-Atholi-Cheekkilode-Thiruvangoor-Kappad-Thoovapara stands **revoked**.

ITEM NO.53

Heard. This is an application for delay condonation for producing current records for fresh permit to operate on the route Farook College – Chaliyam Angadi – Meleputhukcode (via) Ramanattukara, Perumugham Road, Pullikkadavu touching Pulliparambu, Kallampara and Prabodhini; Ramanattukara – Meleputhukcode via. Parammal Road, Parammal and Puthukcode and Ramanattukara – Feroke Bus Stand via. Perumugham Road, Vadakke Bazaar, Udayamangalam Kshethram and Nallur. Kshethram as O.S. which was granted by RTA dated 27.02.2024 vide supplementary item no 6.

Regular permit was granted by RTA Kozhikode in its meeting held on 27.02.2024 vide supplementary item no 6. The applicant was directed to produce the current records within one month from the date of communication of decision, failing which sanction will be revoked without further notice.. Proceedings issued on 15.05.2024. On 15.06.2024 applicant filed an application and requested to grant further time for production of current records.

Rule 159 (2) KMV Rules, specify that in the event of any applicant failing to produce the certificate of registration within the period specified (not exceeding 4 months), authority may revoke the sanction of the application. In this case applicant failed to produce records within 14.09.2024. Hence the request to condone the delay is **rejected**. The regular permit granted by this authority on the route Farook College – Chaliyam

Angadi - Meleputhukkode (via) Ramanattukara, Perumugham Road, Pullikkadavu touching Pulliparambu, Kallampara and Prabodhini; Ramanattukara - Meleputhukkode via. Parammal Road, Parammal and Puthukkode and Ramanattukara - Feroke Bus Stand via. Perumugham Road, Vadakke Bazaar, Udayamangalam Kshethram and Nallur Kshethram stands **revoked**.

ITEM NO.54

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular permit on the route Beypore-East Hill Art Gallery-Puthiyappa as ordinary service. The self same route was operated by the applicant on regular permit using the SC KL07 AN 9432. Even though the renewal was granted by the authority the applicant failed to renew the permit. He has now applied for fresh permit on the same route.

Application is considered fresh. There is no objectionable overlapping with the notified scheme of KSRTC. SC KL 11X 0884 offered by the applicant is operating on the strength of temporary permits from 07.11.2022 on the route in view of orders of Hon'ble STAT in M.V.A.A No.224/2022 dated 07.11.2022, M.V.A.A No.94/2023 dated 26.04.2023, M.V.A.A No.229/2023 dated 26.08.2023, M.V.A.A No.3/2024 dated 12.01.2024, M.V.A.A No :135/2024 dated 01.06.2024, M.V.A.A No.214/2024 dated 3.10.2024 with the existing timing of SC KL 07 AN 9432.

Hence Regular Permit **granted** to SC KL11X0884 with the existing timings of SC KL 07 AN 9432.

ITEM NO.55

Heard. This is an application for variation of permit in respect of **S/C KL 10 AG 1259** conducting service on the route Manakadavu-Pantheerankavu with variation of single trip extension from Pantheerankavu to Perumanna and diversion of one existing trip from Mankavu to city via Lulumall-Pushapa junction-MIMS hospital-New bus stand-CPO

The field officer reported that existing services from Kozhikode to Perumanna will not be adversely affected with this extension and variation will be beneficial to the travelling public. Since the vehicle operates from 6.03am to 10.40pm, it operates more than 17 hours, which is against the existing labour laws. Hence two sets of crew may be required to operate.

Hence application of variation of permit is **granted** subject to the settlement of timings and without change in the existing timings other than the variation and operating service with two sets of crew.

ITEM NO.56

Heard. This is an application for variation of Permit in respect of **S/C KL 10 Z 2248** conducting service on the route Pullikkadavu-Marad-Feroke-Nallur-Beyppore with Variation of extension from Marad to Chakkumkadavu via Payyanakkal and Nallur to Mukkathukadavu via Mannor valavu.

During the meeting the applicant submitted an application not to consider this application. Request considered and application for variation of permit is **rejected**

ITEM NO.57

Heard. This is an application for variation of permit in respect of **S/C KL 37 0364** conducting service on the route Kunnathu palam-medical college-Mathara with additional round trip between Ramanatukara and Meleputhukkode.

The field officer reported that the portion of the route from Azhimjilam-Parammal(1.2km),Parammal-Mele Puthukkode (3km) lies in Malappuram district.

Hence Secretary RTA is directed to obtain concurrence from Sister RTA Malappuram. For compliance of above the decision of this application is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.58

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit in respect of **S/C KL 11 BS 0469** conducting service on the route Cherukulam-Chevarambalam-Pavangad-Westhill-Nadakkavu-City with curtailment of the first and last trip from Cherukulam to Chevarambalam.

The enquiry officer reported that Stage carriage KL-11-U-1096 departs from Cherukulam at 5.50am. Another SC KL-40-B-1410 departs Cherukulam at 6.15am. Similarly, KL-11-U-1096 departs City at 9.40pm and halts at Cherukulam at 10.20pm. Hence the curtailment of the trips at 6.00 am from Cherukulam and the last trip with halt at 10.15 will not seriously affect the prospects of any travelling public.

Hence application of variation of permit is **granted**, subject to the settlement of timings without change in the existing timings other than the variation.

ITEM NO.59

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit in respect of **S/C KL 10 AC 0936** conducting service on the route Mukkathukadavu-Medical college-Mannur valavu-Feroke-Mathottam with extending trips from Cheruvannur junction to Kunnathupalam via Kolathara by curtailment of trip from Cheruvannur junction to Mathottam on the existing regular route.

The field officer reported the curtailment from Cheruvannur junction to Mathottam will adversely affect the travelling public and the extension of trip from Cheruvannur Junction to Kolathara is advantageous to travelling public.

On verification of the enquiry report the following facts to be verified.

1. The actual impact to the travelling public by the extension and curtailment are not clear from the report. Whether the extension overweighs the curtailment has to be ascertained

2. Frequency of the services on the applied route is not submitted by the field officer.

Secretary RTA is directed to conduct a specific enquiry on the above facts and place before the next RTA. Hence the decision of this application is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.60

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit in respect of **S/C S/C KL 14 F 0399** conducting service on the route Pantheerankavu-Medical college-Kunnathupalam with variation for four trip extension from Mankavu to Valayanadu junction and single trip deviation from Pottammal to Landmark junction instead of Medical college and return.

During the hearing, several objections were received against this variation stating that extension and deviation of trips are through well served areas. This leads to unhealthy competition and accidents.

On verification of agenda, report and connected records, it is ascertained that there is no need for extension and deviation and curtailment will affect the travelling public.

Hence the application for variation is **rejected**.

ITEM NO.61

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit in respect of **S/C KL 13 R 0102** conducting service on the route Vellayikkode-City-Nadakkavu-Eranjipalam-Karaparamba-Easthill-Parammal with curtailment of single trip from Perumanaa to Vellayikkode and diversion of single trip from Perumanna to Kurinjedathpalam instead of Perumanna to Vellayikode.

The field officer reported that additional trip to Kurinjedathpalam is beneficial to the public, since the direct services to Kurinjedathpalam from City are very less. Reduction of single trip between Perumanna and Vellayikkode will not adversely affect the public, since in the last six months, two stage carriage permits with about 35 trips between Perumanna and Vellayikkode has been granted to cater the need of travelling public of this area.

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

ITEM NO.62

Applicant is absent when the matter was considered. Hence decision of the application for variation of permit in respect of **S/C KL 18 C 1497** is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.63

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit in respect of **S/C KL 57 AA 2475** conducting service on the route Kozhikode-Koodaranji-Medical college-Karanthur-Kunnamangalam-REC-Mukkam-Karamoola-Manakkadavu bridge with Variation of one additional trip from Kunnamangalam to Mukkam via REC, without changes in existing timings.

The enquiry officer reported that all existing trips are retained. Additional trips are introduced to benefit passengers. Early morning passengers will benefit from this variation.

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

ITEM NO.64

Heard. This is an adjourned application for variation of permit in respect of **S/C KL373194** conducting service on the route Vellannur – Mavoor – Kunnamangalam – Chathamangalam – Poovattuparamba – Varittiyakkil – Peringolam – Pernumanna as Mofussil service with variation requested: 1. Two additional trips from Kurikkathur to Perumanna. 2. Single trips curtailment from Chethukadavu to Kurikkathur. This application considered by this authority on 27.02.2024 vide item 47 and adjourned for enquiry on the impact of curtailment on the existing route.

The field officer reported that the length of the portion proposed for curtailment is 9 kms and adversely affect the travelling public. During the hearing, severe objections were also received against the curtailment of trips.

Hence the application for variation is **Rejected**

ITEM NO.65

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit in respect of S/C KL38F4708 conducting service on the route Kozhikode – Koorattupara – Medical College – Cherinchal – Kunnamangalam – Koduvally – Thamarassery – Koenchery – Nellipoyil - Narangathode as Mofussil service.. Variation to deviate 2 single trips between Kunnamangalam MLA Road Ju. And Kottamparambu (via) Cherinchal (2.6 km) instead of (via) Peringolam (3.3 km) and to deviate 3rd single trip (having Kozhikode Departure time 8.15am) from Kodenchery to Meenmutti Kavala (via) Kannothe, Markaz Knowledge City and Chembukadavu (11.7 km) instead of (via) Pulikkayam (3.7 km) and curtailment of the trip from Nellipoyil to Narangathode (1.6 km) on the existing regular route.

The field officer has not specified the overlapping in the notified sector and the impact of the proposed curtailment.

Hence the Secretary RTA is directed to obtain specific report for the above facts and place before next RTA. Hence decision of this application is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.66

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit in respect of S/C KL574239 conducting service on the route Kunduparamba – Odumbrakadavu – increasing 2 trips from West Hill to Kunduparamba, 16 trips Odumbrakadavu – Kunduparamba as City service with extension from Odumbrakadavu to Kunduparamba (14 single trips) (1.6km) and from extension from Kunduparamba to Mokavur (round trip) via Service Road (1.4km) and return from Mokavur via Malikkadavu Service Road (2.4km) and additional cut trip between Odumbrakadavu and City (6.2km) by curtailment from City to Kunduparamba (8.2km) up and down single trips on the existing regular route.

The field officer reported that total variation distance is 19.8 km and existing timings are shuffled. During the meeting several objections were received against the proposed curtailment.

On verification of application, report and connected records it is ascertained that the proposed extension is through well served sectors and curtailment will affect the travelling public. The existing timings are shuffled and to arrive at a clash free timings is not feasible.

Hence the application for variation of permit is **Rejected**

ITEM NO.67

Heard. This is an application for variation of permit in respect of S/C KL12K3303 conducting service on the route Narikkuni – Kozhikode – Madavoor – Padanilam – Kunnamangalam – Medical College as Mofussil service with 1 trip curtailment from Kunnamangalam to Kozhikode on the existing route.

The field officer reported that this proposal is to curtail the portion from Kunnamangalam to Kozhikode via Karanthur, and back. Existing stage carriages conducting service in this portion will cater to the need of travelling public and curtailment will not affect the travel prospects of the general public.

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

ITEM NO.68

Heard. This is an application for variation of permit in respect of S/C KL57A3546 conducting service on the route Koduvally – Mukkam – Thamarassery – C M Makham as Mofussil service with variation from Nellamkandy to Vattoli (Parakkunnu – Ozhalakkunnu), Curtailment from Nellamkandy to Thamarassery NH.

During the meeting KSRTC objected the variation stating that the appellant is presently operating on the route Thamarassery-Koduvally-Mukkam and the route length is 29.7 Km .Existing route is overlapping a distance of 7 Km from Koduvally to Thamarassery through the notified route Kozhikode-Mananthavady Vide Notification No. 13/2023/Trans,Dated03.05.2023.The permit holder applied for the variation U/S 80(3) of MV Act 1988. The variation included additional trips through the notified route.At present, the applicant is operating 6 trips between Koduvally and Thamarassery. The proposed variation is to increase the trip as 8, through the notified route . Any violation of Clause 19 of the scheme has to be ascertained.

Hence Secretary RTA is directed to obtain a detailed report for the above facts. Hence the decision of this application is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.69

Heard. This is an application for variation of Permit in respect of **S/C KL 42 D 6992** operating on the route Kappakkal Beach -Ummalathurthazham via Medical college - Payyanakkal-City stop and Mavoor Road as Town/City service with Variation from 1)Baby Memorial Hospital to Valayanad Temple 2) Two Additional trip to Ummalathoor thazham ,pottammal ,city 3) Up and Down Trip curtailment from MCC bank to Kappakkal , on the existing regular route.

During the meeting, severe objections were received against the proposed curtailment.

Field officer reported that there is no necessity under rule 145(6) of KMV rule 1989.

Hence the application for variation of permit is **Rejected**.

ITEM NO.70

Heard. This is an application for the request for grant of concurrence for a variation of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 58 A 7333 conducting service on the route Wandoor-Mukkam Via Elankur-Manjeri-Kavanur-Areekode-Eranhimavu. Variation applied for the extension of route from Mukkam to Thamarassery (Via) Omassery, Koodathai,Chungam.

The Enquiry report reveals that the distance of extension is 15 Km. In the extended route, portion from Thamarassery Chungam to Thamarassery Bus Stand(1.5 Km) overlaps nationalised routes(1) Kozhikode-Mananthavady (SI No.27) and Kozhikode-Meppady(SI No.28) and is a clear violation of GO(P)13/2023/Tran dated 03.05.2023.

Hence request for grant of concurrence is **rejected**.

ITEM NO.71

Heard. This is an application for variation of Permit in respect of **S/C KL 57 B 6566** Operating on the route City stand -Kacherikunnu via. Kunduparamba -Mokavoor CITY as Town/City service

During the meeting objections were received regarding the last trip curtailment that will affect the night passengers of Kunduparambu to City. As per the proposed timings the

existing timing from Kunduparamba at 8.05pm and 9.05pm to City is curtailed. Moreover, Field officer has reported that there is no necessity under rule 145(6) of KMV rule 1989. Hence the application for variation of permit is **Rejected**.

ITEM NO.72

Heard. This is an application for variation of Permit in respect of **S/C KL 57 3379** which was replaced by **KL 59 Q 6696** Operating on the route Badiroor - Kulangarapeedika -Medical college as Town /City service

This application was earlier considered by this authority on 11-05-2022 vide Item no 34 for ascertaining the impact of curtailment to the travelling public. During the meeting several objections were received against the curtailment of trips to Medical college. On verification of application, report and connected records this authority is convinced that the proposed variation will not be beneficial for the public. This authority is of the view that no new circumstances have arisen, as per rule 145(6) of KMV rule 1989.

Hence the application for variation of permit is **Rejected**.

ITEM NO.73

Heard. This is an application for variation of Permit in respect of **S/C KL 11 W 6939** Operating on the route Medical college -Marad beach via. Gotheeswaram -Mavoor road - Meenchand-Payyanakkal -as Town /City service with 1.Curtailment of Medical college - Gotheeswaram trip at Marad beach 2.Curtailment of one up and down trip from Gotheeswaram to City .

During the meeting, objections were received against the proposed curtailments. Field officer reported that there is no necessity under rule 145(6) of KMV rule 1989.

On verification of application, report and connected records, it is ascertained that Gotheeswaram is in the interior area of the city and this curtailment will affect the present travelling facility of travelling public. This authority is of the view that no new circumstances have arisen as per under rule 145(6) of KMV rule 1989. Hence the application for variation of permit is **Rejected**.

ITEM NO.74

Heard. This is an application for variation of Permit in respect of **S/C KL 57 B 7434** Operating on the route Calicut city stand -Manakadav -via Pantheerankavu as Town /City service with variation to extension two single trips Pantheerankavu to Perumanna on the existing regular route.

The field officer reported that halting place is proposed to be changed from City Stand, where no convenient parking place is available, to Perumanna to mitigate the traffic congestion in and around Mananchira.

During the meeting objections received against the curtailment.

Secretary RTA is directed to obtain the impact of curtailment and frequency of stage carriages services on the applied sector.

Hence decision of this application is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.75

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit in respect of **S/C KL 58 D 9594** conducting service on the route Arappuzha to Medical College via Mavoor road, Perumanna via Pantheerankavu, Mankavu, city stand. The field officer reported that the total distance of variation is 18Km. During the hearing, it is pointed out the primary route sanctioned has been drastically changed due to variation applications submitted by the permit holder.

Hence Secretary RTA is directed to enquire and report on this aspect and place before next RTA. Hence decision of this application is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.76

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit in respect of **S/C KL 84 B 8467** conducting service on the route Paruthippara-Harijan Colony-Medical College-Farook College. The field officer reported that as per existing permit and existing timings, the vehicle KL-84-B-8467 is conducting 4 single trips to Farook College via. Feroke Chunkam. Hence up and down single trips between Feroke Petta and Feroke Chunkam (nationalized sector) will be increased due to the proposed variation. Clause 19 of the GO(P) No. 42/2009/Tran dated 14/7/2009, modified as per G.O. (P) No. 13/2023/TRANS dated 03.5.2023 (SRO No. 537/2023) will be violated as per the proposed variation.

Hence the application for variation is **Rejected**.

ITEM NO.77

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit in respect of **S/C KL 13 S 7835** conducting service on the route Beypore-Malikadavu- via Karaparamba-Krishnannair road with 1.Extending 4 trips from Malikadavu to Pottattuthazham 2.Change of halting place from Malikadavu to Pottattuthazham .

The field officer reported that stage carriage, KL- 13-S- 7835 is currently operating with Temporary Permit on this very same route. In the proposed variation, all existing trips are retained. Additional four trips are introduced to benefit passengers of the Puttattthazham area. Introduction of this extension, will benefit all passengers including students.

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

ITEM NO.78

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit in respect of **S/C KL 57 F 9005** conducting service on the route Kozhikode-Arekode-Mavoor-Pathanapuram- via Medical College- Kuttikkatur- Poovatuuparamba -REC, Mukkom with deviating all trips via MVR Hospital (1.5km) on the Vellalassery – Choolur portion and to change halting place from Kuttikatur to Peruvzhikkadavu by extending the route from Peruvayal to Kuttikkatur via Cherukulathur, Peruvzhikkadavu, Kurikkathur and Peringalom (9.5km) by curtailment of existing halting single trip from Peruvayal to Kuttikkatur via Poovattuparamba (5km) without changing existing timings on the existing route

The enquiry officer reported that all trips are deviating through the MVR hospital and extension from Peruvayal to Kuttikatoor via Cherukulathur, Peruvanhikkadav, Kurikathur and Peringolam will be useful for the travelling public.

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

ITEM NO.79

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit in respect of **S/C KL 11 BB 8367** conducting service on the route Chelavoor –Mankavu via City with 4 single trip deviation from Mananchira to LIC, via MIMS hospital, Arayidathupalam, Moffusil Busstant , CPO

During the meeting, objections received against the curtailment portion.

Hence Secretary RTA is directed to enquire about the impact of the curtailment through the Railway Station and to submit a detailed feasibility report .

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

ITEM NO.80

Heard. This is an application for Renewal of Permit and Replacement of Vehicle in respect of KL 11 R 1824 conducting service on the route Kozhikode-Thengilakadavu-Mavoor –

The enquiry officer reported that stage carriage KL 11 R 1824 was scrapped and not existing , also the permit of the above vehicle was expired on 31-12-2021

1.Hence application for renewal is rejected

2.Renewal of permit is rejected.Hence replacement also **rejected**.

ITEM NO.81

Heard. This is an application for Renewal of Permit and Replacement of Vehicle in respect of KL 11 S 1269 conducting service on the route Palakkottuvayal- City-Marad Beach-Perumanna-via Mavoor road-Kallai-Payyanakkal-Malaparamba-Civil Station.

The regular permit expired on 25-12-2022. The permit holder applied for renewal of permit on 06-12-2022 which is in time and is pending

1.Hence **Renewal** of permit **Granted** subject to

a)Production of NOC from HP Company,if applicable

b)Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

c)Secretary RTA is permitted to endorse renewal from the date of application for renewal subject to realization of compounding fee for permit less operation, if any detected and remittance of application fee, if not paid

2.Replacement

Secretary RTA shall replace the vehicle, on renewal of permit, subject to the settlement of govt.dues if any

ITEM NO.82

Heard. This is an application for Renewal of regular Permit in respect of S/C KL18B2893 on the route Oorkkadavu – Vellimadukkunnu – Gothikkadavu – Pallithazham – Keezhmad – Medical College – Chevayur - Chevarambalam as ordinary service.

The permit expired on 10.04.2023 and renewal application was submitted only on 21.03.2024. As per the KMV Act 81(3) the Regional Transport Authority or the State Transport Authority as the case may be entertain an application for the renewal of permit after the last date specified in that sub section, if it is satisfied that the applicant was prevented by good and sufficient cause from making an application within the time specified. The applicant has not produced sufficient reason for delay in filing in application after the prescribed time limit. Hence, to offer a chance to applicant to furnish

a valid reason (if any) to entertain the application as permissible under section 81(3) of Motor Vehicle Act 1988, decision of the application of the renewal of permit is **adjourned**.

ITEM NO.83

Applicant is absent. Hence **Adjourned**.

ITEM NO.84

Heard. This is an application for the replacement of permit application in respect of SC KL 10 AB 4761 by KL09X8209

Granted subject to the Clearance of Govt.dues of outgoing Vehicle.

ITEM NO.85

Heard. This is an application for delay condonation in respect of Renewal permit of S/C **KL 57 N 6060** conducting service on the route Palangad –Ekarool via Narikkuni Balussery ,Elettil vattoli , iyyad Ekarool via Narikkuni Balussery ,Elettil vattoli , iyyad Ekarool as Mofussil Service.

Delay condoned.Renewal of permit **Granted** subject to

a)Production of NOC from HP Company,if applicable

b)Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.86

Heard. This is an application for replacement vehicle S/C KL 57 B 7059 conducting service on the route Areekode-Kozhikode via touching Thottumukkom , Odakkayam via Pathanapuram ,Valillapuzha ,Erannhimavu and Mavor as Mofussil service by S/C KL 84 B 4988.

Granted subject to the Clearance of Govt.dues of outgoing Vehicle.

ITEM NO.87

Heard. This is an application for Renewal of permit and Transfer of permit [death] in respect of **S/C KL 18 K 9799** conducting service on the route Chelavoor –City Via Moozhikkal,Vellimadukunnu,Malaparamba,Nadakkavu.

Renewal of permit and transfer of permit(death) **Granted** subject to

a)Production of NOC from HP Company,if applicable

b)Clearance of dues to Govt. if any .

ITEM NO.88

Heard. This is an application for Renewal of Permit and Replacement of Vehicle in respect of KL 10 Z 9436 conducting service on the route Thamarassery- Mukkom-Cheruvady- Areekode by KL 09 U 7232.

The permit holder intimated that the vehicle was theft on 15/06/2022. The matter was enquired through Asst. Motor vehicle inspector, Sub RTO, Koduvally and reported that the chasis and engine of the above said vehicle is kept under the custody of Mukkom police.During the hearing,it is submitted that FIR No.337/2022 has been filed before Mukkom Police Station in this matter.

The Secretary RTA is directed to report present position of FIR. Hence **Adjourned**.

ITEM NO.89

Heard. This is an application to re-consider the adjourned item no. 43 which is granted by RTA dated 21/8/2023 for Renewal of regular Permit in respect of **S/C KL 07 AQ 8897** on the route Mavoor –Kunnamangalam Via Kanniparamba Muzhappa Vellur And Chathamangalam.The decision was adjourned to furnish a valid reason (if any) to entertain the application as permissible under section 81(3) of Motor Vehicle Act 1988 On 17/04/2024, the permit holder appeared for personal hearing with medical certificate.

Hence Delay condoned. Renewal of permit **Granted** subject to

- a)Production of NOC from HP Company,if applicable
- b)Clearance of dues to Govt. if any
- c)Secretary RTA is permitted to endorse renewal from the date of application for renewal subject to realization of compounding fee for permit less operation, if any detected

ITEM NO.90

Heard. This is an application to consider the belated application for Renewal of regular Permit in respect of S/C KL57 P 7922 on the route Kozhikode – Thiuvambady-Mukkom-Omassery- via Medical College karanthur- REC East malayamma _Mutheri Kallurutty-manssery-and Agastiamuzhi

Delay Condoned. Renewal of permit **Granted** subject to

- a)Production of NOC from HP Company,if applicable
- b)Clearance of dues to Govt. if any
- c)Secretary RTA is permitted to endorse renewal from the date of application for renewal subject to realization of compounding fee for permit less operation, if any detected .

ITEM NO.91

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of S/C **KL 11 BQ 0326** is **allowed** subject to

- a)Production of NOC from HP Company,if applicable
- b)Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.92

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of S/C **KL 11 V 2001** is **allowed** subject to

- a)Production of NOC from HP Company,if applicable
- b)Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.93

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of S/C **KL 73 2475** is **allowed** subject to

- a)Production of NOC from HP Company,if applicable
- b)Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.94

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of S/C **KL 12 F 1047** is **allowed** subject to

- a)Production of NOC from HP Company,if applicable
- b)Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.95

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of S/C **KL 11 BS 1044** is **allowed** subject to

- a)Production of NOC from HP Company,if applicable
- b)Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.96

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of S/C **KL 10 Z 2248** is **allowed** subject to

- a)Production of NOC from HP Company,if applicable
- b)Clearance of dues to Govt. if any.

ITEM NO.97

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of S/C **KL 65 0260** is **allowed** subject to

- a)Production of NOC from HP Company,if applicable
- b)Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.98

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of S/C **KL 51 2300** is **allowed** subject to

- a)Production of NOC from HP Company,if applicable
- b)Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.99

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of S/C **KL 11 BF 1504** is **allowed** subject to

- a)Production of NOC from HP Company,if applicable
- b)Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.100

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of S/C **KL 58 D 0096** is **allowed** subject to

- a)Production of NOC from HP Company,if applicable
- b)Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.101

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of S/C **KL 11 AX 0261** is **allowed** subject to

- a)Production of NOC from HP Company,if applicable
- b)Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.102

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of S/C **KL 05 AB 2010** is **allowed** subject to

- a)Production of NOC from HP Company,if applicable
- b)Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.103

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of S/C **KL 07 CH 0882** is **allowed** subject to

- a)Production of NOC from HP Company,if applicable
- b)Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.104

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of S/C **KL 11 BP 0353** is **allowed** subject to

- a)Production of NOC from HP Company,if applicable
- b)Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.105

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage **KL09W4650** is **allowed** subject to

- a)Production of NOC from HP Company,if applicable

b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.106

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of S/C KL10AA3046 is **allowed** subject to

a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable

b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.107

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage KL11AC3115 is **allowed** subject to

a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable

b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.108

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage KL11AF3456 is **allowed** subject to

a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable

b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.109

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage KL11AG3222 is **allowed** subject to

a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable

b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.110

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage KL11AY4599 is **allowed** subject to

a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable

b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.111

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage KL56E2793 is **allowed** subject to

a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable

b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.112

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage KL57G3016 is **allowed** subject to

a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable

b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.113

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage KL57M3902 is **allowed** subject to

a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable

b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.114

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage KL57N3885 is **allowed** subject to

a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable

b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.115

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage KL57V2898 is **allowed** subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.116

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage KL58D2562 is **allowed** subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.117

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage KL60B2876 is **allowed** subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.118

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage KL584165 is **allowed** subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.119

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage KL11X4103 is **allowed** subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.120

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage KL76A4689 is **allowed** subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.121

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage **KL59A6543** is **allowed** subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.122

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage **KL 57 M 5837** is **allowed** subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.123

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage **KL57K6215** is **allowed** subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.124

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage **KL57C5449** is **allowed** subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.125

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage **KL11AF6576** is **allowed** subject to
a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.126

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage **KL57H6559** is **allowed** subject to
a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.127

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage **KL57C5314** is **allowed** subject to
a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.128

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage **KL56G5298** is **allowed** subject to
a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.129

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage **KL58F7118** is **allowed** subject to
a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.130

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage **KL13R7027** is **allowed** subject to
a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.131

Heard.

1. The permit holder filed a submission along with a new application for transfer of permit. In the submission the permit holder requested to cancel the permission granted for transfer of permit by the RTA in the meeting held on 27.02.2024 and also to consider his new application for transfer of permit. Subsequently both the permit holder Sri Muhammad Shafi C K and transferee Smt Nisha K P were heard on 27.08.2024 by the Secretary RTA and they submitted that they don't need the transfer of permit granted by the RTA held on 27.02.2024. Hence the decision of RTA dated 27.02.2024 vide item 99 stands **revoked**.

2 Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage **KL57P5554** to Sri. Denesan Umarote is **allowed** subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Remittance of fee
- c) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.132

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage **KL11AA7191** is **allowed** subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.133

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage **KL11AG5607** is **allowed** subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.134

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage **KL11AW9197** is **allowed** subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.135

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage **KL11BC9145** is **allowed** subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.136

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage **KL11AE7900** is **allowed** subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.137

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage **KL18N8082** is **allowed** subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.138

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage **KL739279** is **allowed** as ordinary service subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.139

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage **KL73A8676** is **allowed** subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.140

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage **KL57M7999** is **allowed** subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.141

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of S/C **KL18F8399** is **allowed** subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.142

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage **KL408595** is **allowed** subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.143

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage **KL11X8721** is **allowed** subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.144

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage **KL 57 A 9639** is **allowed** subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.145

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage **KL11BK8162** is **allowed** subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.146

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage **KL38C8244** is **allowed** subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.147

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage **KL10Z9493** is **allowed** subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.148

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage **KL12D9533** is **allowed** subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.149

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage **KL06D8902** is **allowed** subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.150

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage **KL56C8395** is **allowed** subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.151

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of S/C **KL56T9815** is **allowed** subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

ITEM NO.152

Heard.It is reported by the enquiry officer that the crew of stage carriage KL 49 C 5004 had misbehaved with the passenger and curtailed the trip. Hence Secretary RTA shall issue showcause notice to the permit holder calling for explanation for not suspending the permit.If the explanation is not satisfactory,the permit shall be suspended for 10 days from 01.11.2024. The permit holder shall intimate the place of garage of vehicle and Secretary RTA shall watch the service of the vehicle. The permit holder is also given an option to remit the fine for Rs.7500/- in lieu of suspension.

ITEM NO.153

Heard.It is reported by the enquiry officer that the crew of stage carriage KL13AD8699 had misbehaved with the crew of other stage carriages. Hence Secretary RTA shall issue show cause notice to the permit holder calling for explanation for not suspending the permit. If the explanation is not satisfactory, the permit shall be suspended for 10 days from 01.11.2024. The permit holder shall intimate the place of garage of vehicle and Secretary RTA shall watch the service of the vehicle. The permit holder is also given an option to remit the fine for Rs.7500/- in lieu of suspension.

ITEM NO.154

Heard.It is reported that the stage carriage KL12D7515 is conducting service violating the permit conditions. Hence Secretary RTA shall issue show cause notice to the permit holder calling for explanation for not suspending the permit. If the explanation is not satisfactory, the permit shall be suspended for 10 days from 01.11.2024. The permit holder shall intimate the place of garage of vehicle and Secretary RTA shall watch the service of the vehicle. The permit holder is also given an option to remit the fine for Rs.7500/- in lieu of suspension.

ITEM NO.155

Heard.The existing stages on the route,distance between the stages, and fixation of fares as per the Govt.Notification,vide GO(P)No.17/2022 /Trans dtd 30.04.2022 is to be ascertained.Report submitted by Secretary R.T.A, is not specific and is incomplete. Hence Secretary R.T.A,shall conduct a detailed enquiry in this regard and submit specific report with recommendations and place in next RTA. Hence **Adjourned**.

ITEM NO.156

Heard.**Granted**

ITEM NO.157

Heard.**Allowed**.

ITEM NO.158

അപേക്ഷ പരിഗണിച്ചു. ഈ അപേക്ഷ കോഴിക്കോട് - മാവൂർ റൂട്ടിൽ പാറമ്മൽ -- കല്ലുള്ളി എന്നീ ബസ്സ് സ്റ്റോപ്പുകൾക്കിടയിലുള്ള മറ്റ് ഉറ കോളേജ്, സ്കൂൾ സമീപമുള്ള റോഡിൽ ബസ്സ് സ്റ്റോപ്പ് അനുവദിക്കുന്നതിനുള്ള അപേക്ഷയാണ്.

ഈ വിഷയത്തിൽ ക്രമസമാധാനപാലന ചുമതലയുള്ള പോലീസ് അതോറിറ്റിയുടെയും തദ്ദേശ സ്വയം ഭരണ സ്ഥാപനത്തിന്റെ എഞ്ചിനീയറിംഗ് വിഭാഗത്തിൽ നിന്നും സാധ്യത റിപ്പോർട്ട് തേടുവാനും നിലവിലുള്ള ട്രാഫിക് സംവിധാനത്തിന് തടസ്സമില്ലാത്ത രീതിയിൽ ബസ് ബേ ഒരുക്കുന്നതിനുള്ള സൗകര്യങ്ങൾ ലഭ്യമാണോ എന്ന് പരിശോധിച്ച് റിപ്പോർട്ട് നൽകുവാനും സെക്രട്ടറി ആർ ടി എ യോട് നിർദ്ദേശം നൽകി കൊണ്ട് ബസ് സ്റ്റോപ്പിനുള്ള അപേക്ഷയിലുള്ള തീരുമാനം അടുത്ത മീറ്റിംഗിലേക്കു മാറ്റി വരുന്നു.

SUPPLEMENTARY DECISION OF REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY KOZHIKODE DATED 05.09.2024

SUPPLEMENTARY ITEM NO.1

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit on the intra district route Velliparambu – Kozhikkode Palayam Stand – Oorkkadavu (via) Punathil Bazaar, Palaazhi, Hilite Mall, Paalaattukavu, Methottuthazham, Kommeri, Valayanad Temple, Lulu Mall and Puthiya Bus Stand and Pottammal Junction with halting place at Velliparambu as Mofussil Service.

1.Applicant has not,even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1)of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S.A.

The applicant has offered a “suitable vehicle “ that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any ,for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application.

No ready vehicle offered by the applicant

2.The detailed report on frequency of trips and services offered by the applicant reveals that the entire trips except starting and halting from termini lies in the city limit from Punathil Bazaar to Palayam Bus stand and back , this is not beneficial to travelling public residing at the area where the Moffusil part of the route lies.Also the portion of the route where the trips proposed to operate as in the time schedule submitted by the applicant are well served by the other operators and KSRTC,also lies in city with frequency of trips in a time gap of 5 minutes from Punathil Bazaar to Pottammal and a time gap 1 minute from Pottammal to Palayam bus stand at peak hours.

So it is obvious that the objections of other operators alleging “this application is to only overcome the legal restrictions imposed by the City permits” is true. Introduction of new stage carriage permits in the route as per the time schedule proposed by the applicant will seriously affect the peace and the tranquillity of the entire sector, also cause time clash and and unhealthy competition with existing operators.

In Subhash Chandra V state UP (1980) 2 SSC 324 The Apex court held that the provisions under Motor Vehicle Act are geared for public safety and not for private profit

and cast a duty up on the authorities to protect Indian lives moving in buses, working on roads or even standing on margins. So the Motor Vehicle Act has been enacted not for granting benefits to transport operators but with an object of Preventing unhealthy competition between Transporters one among the host of other issues relating to motor vehicle and transport.

For the above facts the decision of this application is **rejected**.

SUPPLEMENTARY ITEM NO.2

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit on the intra district route Oorkkadavu – Kozhikkode Palayam Stand (via) Kurinjodathpalam, Perumanna, Puthoormadam, Punathil Bazaar, Palaazhi, Hilite Mall, Paalaattukavu, Methottuthazham and Pottammal Junction with Kozhikkode – Ummalathoor Thazham and Kozhikkode – Velliparambu one round trip each and halting place at Punathil Bazaar as Mofussil Service.

1. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S.A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application.

Ready vehicle not offered by the applicant.

2. In the meeting, several objections were raised by enroute operators that the applicant's intention is to operate as City service. On verification of the timings proposed by the applicant, it is noticed that the service is concentrated in the city area and trips provided to Oorkkadavu is only to overcome the legal restrictions imposed for city permits. While considering the frequency of services, this authority learnt that it is not feasible to provide clash free set of timings on this route. Any introduction of a service will lead to unhealthy competition resulting in accidents.

This authority feels that there is no need for a fresh permit on such a highly saturated route at present.

For the above facts the decision of this application is **rejected**.

SUPPLEMENTARY ITEM NO.3

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit on the intra district route to operate on the route Feroke- Murukallingal Via Chaliyam, Kadalundi Bazar.

1.Applicant has not , even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1)of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S.A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle "that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any ,for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application.

Having regard to the aforesaid provisions of the Act and the Rules, application is adjourned until after the application has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars thereof before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2)of Motor Vehicles Act.

2.During the meeting entire private stage carriages operators on the applied route raised severe objections against this proposal stating that the route is highly saturated and well served and may lead to unhealthy competition between the en route operators and traffic congestion, which in turn will harmfully affect the travelling public as well as other road users.

Hence Secretary RTA is directed to obtain the frequency of stage carriages services on the applied sector. For the compliance of the above; decision of the above item is **adjourned.**

SUPPLEMENTARY ITEM NO.4

Heard. This is an application for fresh regular Stage Carriage permit on the intra district route Govt. Taluk Hospital- Murukallingal Via feroke, Mannur Valavu, Prabhodhini, Mannur Rail.

Applicant has not , even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1)of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S.A.

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle " that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no legal obligation to grant permit to a non-existent

vehicle. The suitability or otherwise of a vehicle is a matter to be determined by this authority and therefore the availability of a ready vehicle is a relevant consideration for the grant of permit. The grant of permit to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. Ready vehicle not offered by the applicant.

During the meeting several objections received against this proposal. The major objections are grant of this permit will create unhealthy competition on the Feroke sector and Feroke Bus stand over crowded with stage carriages.

This authority scrutinized the application, connected reports and the agenda. Granting this application will unsettle the present state of equilibrium of timings, prevailing among the stage carriage operators in the well served sectors of Feroke, Mannur and result in traffic congestion, which in turn will harmfully affect the travelling public as well as other road users.

Hence the above application for fresh permit is **rejected**.

SUPPLEMENTARY ITEM NO.5

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage **KL 76 E 2007** is **allowed** subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any

SUPPLEMENTARY ITEM NO.6

Heard. Transfer of permit in respect of Stage Carriage **KL 76 A 1824** is **allowed** subject to

- a) Production of NOC from HP Company, if applicable
- b) Clearance of dues to Govt. if any.

SUPPLEMENTARY ITEM NO.7

Heard. The Secretary RTA shall continuously watch the service of the vehicle conducting on this route to ensure that the stage carriages are conducting services on the permitted route without violating the provision of scheme, prevalent. If violation is detected, E-challan shall be prepared and showcause notice issued to the permit holders for not suspending or cancellation of permit. A detailed report shall be submitted in the next RTA.

Sri. Snehil Kumar Singh IAS,
District Collector And Chairman,
Regional Transport Authority, Kozhikode



Sri. Nidhinraj.P IPS,
Superintendent of Police, Kozhikode (Rural) And
Member of Regional Transport Authority, Kozhikode



NIDHINRAJ. P IPS
DISTRICT POLICE CHIEF
KOZHICODE RURAL

Sri. C.V.M.Sharief,
Deputy Transport Commissioner, North Zone, Kozhikode
And Member of Regional Transport Authority, Kozhikode

