

DECISION OF REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY, IDUKKI HELD ON 22/08/2024

PRESENT

1. Smt. V. Vighneswary. IAS, District Collector & Chairperson , RTA, Idukki
2. Sri. Anoop Varkey, Deputy Transport Commissioner CZ –II, Ernakulam
& Member , RTA, Idukki

ITEM NO- 1

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage to operate on the route Muttukadu - Pala (Via) Bisonvalley, Kunjithanni, Anachal, Adimaly , Neriya Mangalam, Kothamangalam, Muvattupuzha, Arikkuzha, Pandapally, Palakuzha, Koothattukulam, Uzhavoor, Veliyannoor, Valavoor, Kodakkachira and Pala Kottaramattam Bus Stand as Ordinary Service. The applicant has offered the vehicle KL 05 Z 7 at the time of submitting the application. On verification, it is found that , now this vehicle is owned by another person named Smt Prasanna Vimal. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorizing him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and the prescribed form of permit in form P.St.Sa. The applicant has not , even at the time of hearing in this meeting, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. In this case the vehicle mentioned in the application is owned by another person . This authority is under no legal obligation to grant a permit to a vehicle owned by some other person. 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 favor 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 and in judgement in **Natarajan Vs S T A T (AIR 1999),Kerala,207** and **Narayanan Vs RTA Thrissur (Full Bench) 1980 , KLT 249** application is **adjourned** until 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 72 (2)of Motor Vehicles Act.

ITEM NO- 2

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant

1. Perused the Judgment in WP© No 9215/2024 dated 07/03/2024 of Hon'ble High court of Kerala
2. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage with seating capacity 38 in all to operate on the route Koothattukulam - Adimaly (via) Kozhippally, Kurisupally, Palakkuzha, Marika, Vazhithala, Eruttuthodu, Nediyaasala, Kolani, Manakadu Jn, Highrange Hotel Jn, Thodupuzha, Vengalloor, Kalloor H.S, Paingottor, Oonnukal and Neriyaamangalam as Limited Stop Ordinary Service. It is an inter district route with total route length having 82 Kms , out of which 55.8 Kms lies in the jurisdiction of RTA Idukki and 26.2 Kms lies in the jurisdiction of RTA Muvattupuzha . 300 mts from Koothattukulam Central Jn to Govt Hospital In overlaps with Kottarakkara –Kozhikodu Scheme , 1.2 Km from Thodupuzha bus stand to New KSRTC bus stand overlaps with Kottayam –Kattappana scheme and 1.9 kms from Thodupuzha Gandhi square to Vengalloor signal Jn overlaps with Aluva-Kattappana scheme. The distance between Kolani Jn and High Range Hotel Jn, for 2 KM is virgin portion. RTA Idukki held on 11/01/2023 vide item no 1 considered the application and adjourned for want of concurrence from RTA Muvattupuzha. and that was granted by that authority on 23/12/2023 vide item no 28. Overlapping with a notified route does not exceed 5% of total route length. The Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in its Judgment in WP© No. 9215/2024 dated 07/03/2024, directed the Regional Transport Authority to take final decision thereon. The applicant at the time of hearing, today has offered the vehicle KL 39 N 7321 in her name . Hence fresh regular permit is **granted** to stage carriage KL 39 N 7321 on the route Koothattukulam - Adimaly as ordinary service subject to settlement of timings and production of road fitness certificate of the virgin portion on the route from the concerned authorities. The grantee is directed to produce the current

records of the vehicle within 30 days from the date of communication of the decision as per rule 159 (2) of KMV Rules 1989, failing which the grant of the regular permit will be treated as revoked without further notice.

ITEM NO- 3

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant . This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage with seating capacity 48 in all to operate on the route Rajakkadu - Thodupuzha via Kuthungal, Vattakkannipara, Karimala, Panickankudy, Kambilikandam, Kallarkutty, Adimaly, Neriyamangalam, Oonnukal , Paingottoor, Perumankandam and Vengaloor as Ordinary Service with halt at Karimala. It is an inter district route with total route length having 100.5 Kms , out of which 80.5 Kms lies in the jurisdiction of RTA Idukki and 20 Kms lies in the jurisdiction of RTA Muvattupuzha . 2 kms from Vengaloor to Thodupuzha overlaps with Aluva–Kattappana notified route . RTA Idukki held on 17/08/2023 vide item no 3 considered the application and adjourned for want of concurrence from RTA Muvattupuzha and that authority granted concurrence on 23/12/2023 vide item no 29. Overlapping with notified route does not exceed 5% of total route length. The applicant at the time of hearing today has offered the vehicle KL 40 E 7889 in his name . Hence fresh regular permit is **granted** to stage carriage KL 40 E 7889 on the route Rajakkadu - Thodupuzha as ordinary service subject to settlement of timings. The grantee is directed to produce the current records of the vehicle within 30 days from the date of communication of the decision as per rule 159 (2) of KMV Rules 1989, failing which the grant of the regular permit will be treated as revoked without further notice.

ITEM NO- 4

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant . This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage with seating capacity 38 in all to operate on the route Thodupuzha - Muniyara (via) Vengalloor Signal, Kaloore, Oonnukal, Neriyamangalam, Adimaly, Kallarkutty, Kambilikandam and Panickankudy as Limited stop ordinary service.

The application does not contain the registration number and other particulars of the vehicle for which the permit is sought for. Instead he has offered a 'suitable vehicle' which is not in existence.

At the time of hearing the applicant offered a stage carriage vehicle bearing register number KL 35 B 5962 before this authority as if he had owned the said vehicle. On verification it is found that the said vehicle does not stand registered in the name of the applicant. Now It stands registered in the name of Sri. Aziz Sahib. Therefore the applicant is not the owner of this vehicle as required in Section 2 (30) and Section 66(1) of the MV Act 1988.

According to the revised Section 66(1) of the MV Act 1988 no person other than the owner of a motor vehicle can be authorised to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle. Having regard to the aforesaid provisions of the MV Act and Rules and the form of permit in form Pst and in the light of the judgment of the Hon: High Court of Kerala in Bhaskaran Vs RTA, Alleppy (2003(1) KLT 106) the application is **rejected**

ITEM NO- 5

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant . This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage with seating capacity 48 in all to operate on the route Adimaly - Santhanpara Via Kallarkutty, Vellathooval, Kalathrakuzhy, Rajakkadu, Rajakumary, Pooppara, Kuthumkal, Karimala, Panickankudy and Kambilikandam as Ordinary Service with halt at Karimala.

The application does not contain the registration number and other particulars of the vehicle for which the permit is sought for. Instead he has offered a 'suitable vehicle' which is not in existence.

At the time of hearing the applicant offered a stage carriage vehicle bearing register number KL 58 A 3123 before this authority as if he had owned the said vehicle. On verification it is found that the said vehicle doesn't stand registered in the name of the applicant. It stands registered in the name of Muhammed Kutty and having a valid permit on the route Arangottukara-Perinthalmanna. Therefore the applicant is not the owner of this vehicle as required in Section 2 (30) and Section 66(1) of the MV Act 1988.

According to the revised Section 66(1) of the MV Act 1988 no person other than the owner of a motor vehicle can be authorized to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle. Having regard to the aforesaid provisions of the MV Act and Rules and the form of permit in form Pst and in the light of the judgment of the Hon: High Court of Kerala in Bhaskaran Vs RTA, Alleppy (2003(1) KLT 106) the application is **rejected**.

ITEM NO- 6

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for grant of fresh stage carriage regular permit, on the route Anakkayam - Muvattupuzha Touching Purapuzha and Parakadavu via Inchiyani, Mangattukavala, KSRTC Bus stand, Gandhi Square, Thodupuzha Bus Stand, Irakkumpuzha, Kolani, Nediyaasala, Iruttuthodu, Marika, Vazhithala, Palakkuzha, Pandapilly, Arakkuzha, Muvattupuzha New Bus Stand, P O Junction, Kacherithazham, Muvattupuzha Old Bus Stand, Purappuzha, Vazhithala, Parakkadavu, Arikkuza and Thodupuzha as Ordinary Service.

The applicant has not, even at the time of hearing in this meeting, 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 authorizing him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and the prescribed form of permit 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 a 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 and in the light of the judgement in **Natarajan Vs S T A T (AIR 1999),Kerala,207** and **Narayanan Vs RTA .Thrissur (Full Bench) 1980 , KLT 249** application is **adjourned** until after 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 72 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

ITEM NO- 7

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant.

1.Perused the Judgement in WP© No 1951 /2024 dated 05/02/2024 of Hon'ble High court of Kerala

2. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage with seating capacity 33 in all to operate on the route Kumily - Pamba Dam Via 1st mile, Poomaram, Vellaramkunnu, Chenkara, Walladi, Vandiperiyar, Vallakkadavu, Pachakkanam and Gavi as ordinary service. It is an inter district route with total route length having 71.5 Kms , out of which 56.6 Kms lies in the jurisdiction of RTA Idukki and 14.9 Kms lies in the jurisdiction of RTA Pathanamthitta . A total distance of 2.7 kms from Vandiperyar to Walladi and from Kumily Town to Kumily Bus Stand overlaps with Kottayam – Thekkady Scheme . 7.2 Kms from Poomaram to Walladi is virgin portion. RTA held on 17/08/2023 vide item no 26 considered the application and adjourned to obtain concurrence from the concerned Forest Authorities for issue of new permits to private stage carriages through Periyar Tiger Reserve and also obtain fitness certificate of the virgin portion on the route from the concerned authorities .Road fitness certificate is not given by the PWD authorities after repeated request. Deputy Director (Project Tiger) Periyar East Division ,Thekkady strongly objected the issue of permit since Pachakkanam is a place located within the Periyar Tiger Reserve and the road leading to this area is a part of the Tiger Reserve and hence the status of the road is Tiger Reserve .The Periyar Tiger Reserve is managed as per the prescription of the Tiger Conservation Plan (TCP) which is prepared as per the provisions of Sec. 38 V of the Wildlife Protection Act, 1972 and approved by the National Tiger Conservation Authority under section 38 O(1) (a) of the said Act. The provisions for vehicular traffic regulations in Periyar Tiger Reserve are defined under Para 3.3 'Vehicular Traffic Regulation' of the TCP. It is necessary to further regulate vehicular traffic along the roads. No additional buses will be

allowed. The Hon'ble High Court in the judgment in DBP No. 70/2009 dated 06.07.2011 has clearly observed that though passage through a public highway along the sanctuary is permitted, that is a regulated and restricted passage in terms of Section 27. Hence even if there is public highway through a sanctuary, it can be used only for the restricted purpose of a high way and movement through that cannot, in any manner be utilized for further intrusion into the sanctuary or in any manner affecting faunal, floral, geomorphological, natural or zoological significance of the sanctuary. The Court in the above order has imposed complete prohibition of entry of vehicles from 4th Mile to Uppupara, other than official vehicles for official purposes. The Court also directed to manage the movement of vehicles from Vandiperiyar to Sathram as also from Vandiperiyar to 4th Mile to reduce excessive movement of vehicles from Vandiperiyar. The Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP© No 1951 /2024 dated 05/02/2024 has directed the Regional Transport Authority to consider and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law in the next Board meeting and at any rate within a period of two months. Considering the above facts the application for fresh regular permit to operate on the route Kumily-Pamba Dam is **Rejected.**

ITEM NO- 8

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant . This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage with seating capacity 48 in all to operate on the route Ramakkalmedu-Kothamangalam via Thookkupalam, Thannimoodu, Nedumkandam, Mavady, Perinchankutty, Panikkankudy, Kambilikandam, Kallarkutty, Adimaly, Neriyaamangalam and Oonnukal as Limited Stop Ordinary Service. It is an inter-district route with total route length having 108 Kms , out of which 87 Kms lies in the jurisdiction of RTA Idukki and 21 Kms lies in the jurisdiction of RTA Muvattupuzha. Hence Secretary RTA is directed to seek prior concurrence from RTA Muvattupuzha for the route portion lying within that authority . The applicant is bound to furnish the Registration Mark and other particulars of the vehicle ,offered by him,if any as required by the form PSt SA before the next meeting of this authority . Hence **adjourned.**

ITEM NO- 9

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant . This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage

carriage with seating capacity 38 in all to operate on the route Kattappana – Vandiperiyar via Pallikkavala, Vallakkadavu, Kadamakuzhy, Sasthanada, Anavilasam, Chengara, Mungiyar, Dymukku and Valady with halt at Vellaramkunnu as ordinary service. It is an intra district route with a total route length having 40.3 Kms . As per the report of the field officer 2.7 km from Valady to Vandiperiyar overlaps with Kottayam –Thekkady Scheme. Overlapping with notified routes **exceeds 5%** of total route length. Hence **Rejected.**

ITEM NO-10

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage to operate on the route Thengakal - Thopramkudy Touching Kumily and Vandiperiyar via Chappathu ,Parappu, Kattappana, Erattayar, Chempakapara, Puliyanmala, Puttady, Vellaramkunnu and Chenkara as Ordinary Service.

The applicant has not , even at the time of hearing in this meeting, 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 authorizing him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and the prescribed form of permit 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 a 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 favor 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 and in the light of the judgment in **Natarajan Vs S T A T (AIR 1999),Kerala,207** and **Narayanan Vs RTA .Thrissur (Full Bench) 1980 , KLT 249** application is

adjourned until after 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 72 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

ITEM NO-11

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage with seating capacity 38 in all to operate on the route Koothattukulam-Thodupuzha Via Kozhipilly, Palakkuzha, Marika, Vazhithala, Purappuzha, Nediyasala, Kolani, Erakkumpuzha Pump Junction, Manakkad, Puthupariyaram and Periyambra with halt at Vazhithala as ordinary service. It is an inter-district route with total route length having 32.8 Kms, out of which 24 Kms lies in the jurisdiction of RTA Idukki and 8.8 Kms lies in the jurisdiction of RTA Muvattupuzha. Hence Secretary RTA is directed to seek prior concurrence from RTA Muvattupuzha for the route portion lying within that authority. The applicant is bound to furnish the Registration Mark and other particulars of the vehicle, offered by him, if any as required by the form PSt SA before the next meeting of this authority. Hence **adjourned**.

ITEM NO-12

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage to operate on the route Kattappana - Kumily Touching Nedumkandam and Edataramukku via Puttady, Kuzhitholu, Cumbummettu, Pathumury and Thookkupalam as ordinary service.

The applicant has not, even at the time of hearing in this meeting, 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 authorizing him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and the prescribed form of permit 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 permits 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 a 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.

Having regard to the aforesaid provisions of the Act and the Rules and in the light of the judgement **in Natarajan Vs S T A T (AIR 1999),Kerala,207** and **Narayanan Vs RTA .Thrissur (Full Bench) 1980 , KLT 249** application is **adjourned** until after 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 72 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

ITEM NO-13

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage to operate on the route Nedumkandam – Thodupuzha Via Pachady, Melechinnar, Bethel, Perinchankutty, Murickassery, Poomankandam, Chelachuvadu, Kanjikkuzhi, Venmany, Vannappurm, Kaliyar, Vandamattam, (Vandamattam - Njarukkutty Bypass), Njarukkutty, Muthalakodam and Mangattukavala as Ordinary Service.

The applicant has not, even at the time of hearing in this meeting, 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 authorizing him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and the prescribed form of permit 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 a 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 and in the light of the judgement **in Natarajan Vs S T A T (AIR 1999),Kerala,207** and **Narayanan Vs RTA .Thrissur (Full Bench) 1980 , KLT 249** application is **adjourned** until after 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 72 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

ITEM NO-14

The applicant was absent .Hence adjourned

ITEM NO-15

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant.

1. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 17 B 8797 or a new or suitable stage carriage with seating capacity 33 in all to operate on the route Vagamon - Vandiperiyar via Elappara, Chappathu, Santhipalam, Chenkara, Moongalar, Anakuzhy and Wallardi as Ordinary Service. It is an intra district route with a total route length having 54.2 Kms. 2.6 Kms from Vandiperiyar to Wallardi overlaps with Kottayam – Thekkady Scheme. Overlapping with a notified route does not exceed 5% of total route length. Hence fresh regular permit is **granted** to stage carriage KL 17 B 8797 on the route Vagamon - Vandiperiyar as ordinary service subject to settlement of timings. The grantee is directed to produce the current records of the vehicle within 30 days from the date of communication of the decision as per rule 159 (2) of KMV Rules 1989, failing which the grant of the regular permit will be treated as revoked without further notice.

2. The action taken by Secretary RTA in issue of 4 months temporary permit in respect of stage carriage KL 17 B 8797 to operate on the route Vagamon - Vandiperiyar via Elappara, Chappathu, Santhipalam, Chenkara, Moongalar, Anakuzhy and Wallardi as Ordinary Service is ratified.

ITEM NO-16

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant . This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage with seating capacity 48 in all to operate on the route Pala – Munnar via Mundupalam , Valavoor , Kudakkachira , Uzhavoor , Areekkara , Veliyannoor , Ramapuram junction , Koothattukulam , Kozhipally Kurisu, Palakkuzha , Pandappilly , Muvattupuzha , Kakkadassery , Puthuppady , Kothamangalam, Oonnukal , Neriamangalam, Adimaly and Kallar As Limited Stop ordinary service . It is an inter district route with total route length having 138.1 Kms , out of which 60 Kms lies in the jurisdiction of RTA Idukki , 56.4 kms lies in the jurisdiction of RTA Muvattupuzha and 21.7 kms lies in the jurisdiction of RTA Kottayam . Hence Secretary RTA is directed to seek prior concurrence from RTA Muvattupuzha and Kottayam for the route portion lying within that authority .The applicant is bound to furnish the Registration Mark and other particulars of the vehicle ,offered by him,if any as required by the form PSt SA before the next meeting of this authority . Hence **adjourned.**

ITEM NO-17

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant . This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage with seating capacity 48 in all to operate on the route Peruman Kuthu - Pala Via Mankulam, Adimaly, Neriyamangalam, Oonnukal, Paingottoor, Thodupuzha, Hirange Hotel Jn, HP Pump Junction, Kolani, Vazhithala, Koothattukulam, Valavoor and Uzhavoor as Limited Stop Ordinary Service. It is an inter district route with total route length having 139.4 Kms , out of which 83.3 Kms lies in the jurisdiction of RTA Idukki , 33.7 kms lies in the jurisdiction of RTA Muvattupuzha and 22.4 kms lies in the jurisdiction of RTA Kottayam . Hence Secretary RTA is directed to seek prior concurrence from RTA Muvattupuzha and Kottayam for the route portion lying within that authority .The applicant is bound to furnish the Registration Mark and other particulars of the vehicle ,offered by him,if any as required by the form PSt SA before the next meeting of this authority .The applicant is bound to furnish the Registration Mark and other particulars of the vehicle ,offered by him,if any as required by the form PSt SA before the next meeting of this authority . Hence **adjourned.**

ITEM NO-18

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage to operate on the route Thopramkudy - Karimban Touching Cheruthony, Nedumkandam and Njarakavala via Rajamudi, Upputhodu, Chalikada, Thadiyampadu, Murickassery, Senapathy, Perinchamkutty, Melechinnar, Manjappara, Pachady, Padamugam, Vathikudy, Prakash, Neelivayal and Chappacity as Ordinary Service

The applicant has not, even at the time of hearing in this meeting, 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 authorizing him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and the prescribed form of permit 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 permits 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 a 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 favor 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 and in the light of the judgment in **Natarajan Vs S T A T (AIR 1999), Kerala, 207** and **Narayanan Vs RTA .Thrissur (Full Bench) 1980 , KLT 249** application is **adjourned** until after 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 72 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

ITEM NO-19

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage

carriage to operate on the route Adimaly - Anakkulam touching Munnar Via Kallar, Mankulam, Peechadu, Plamala, Korangatty, Machiplavu, Thokkupara, Iruttukanam, Anachal and 2 nd mile as Ordinary Service.

The applicant has not , even at the time of hearing in this meeting, 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 authorizing him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and the prescribed form of permit 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 permits 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 a 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 favor 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 and in the light of the judgment **in Natarajan Vs S T A T (AIR 1999),Kerala,207 and Narayanan Vs RTA .Thrissur (Full Bench) 1980 , KLT 249** application is **adjourned** until after 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 72 (2)of Motor Vehicles Act.

ITEM NO-20

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant . This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage with seating capacity 38 in all to operate on the route Aluva - Mattupetty via Perumbavoor, Kothamangalam, Neriamangalam, Adimaly, Kallar and Munnar Ordinary Service. It is an inter district route with total route length having 130.7 Kms , out of which 71 Kms lies in the jurisdiction of RTA Idukki , 47.3 kms lies in the jurisdiction of RTA Muvattupuzha and

12.4 kms lies in the jurisdiction of RTA Ernakulam . Hence Secretary RTA is directed to seek prior concurrence from RTA Muvattupuzha and Ernakulam for the route portion lying within that authority . The applicant is bound to furnish the Registration Mark and other particulars of the vehicle ,offered by him,if any as required by the form PSt SA before the next meeting of this authority . Hence **adjourned**.

ITEM NO-21

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant . This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage with seating capacity 38 in all to operate on the route Pazhampillichal - Adimaly via Padikkapp , 14th mile , Machiplavu and Chattuppara as Ordinary Service with halt at Irumbupalam .

The application does not contain the registration number and other particulars of the vehicle for which the permit is sought for. Instead he has offered a 'suitable vehicle' which is not in existence.

At the time of hearing the applicant offered a stage carriage vehicle bearing register number KL 10 Z7507 before this authority as if he had owned the said vehicle. On verification it is found that the said vehicle does not stand registered in the name of the applicant or owned by him.It stands registered in the name of Sri Akshay Shabu and has a valid permit on the route Adimaly-Rajakkad.The applicant has not produced any proof of his ownership or possession of the vehicle, at the time of hearing .Therefore the applicant is not the owner of this vehicle as required in Section 2 (30) and Section 66(1) of the MV Act 1988.

According to the revised Section 66(1) of the MV Act 1988 no person other than the owner of a motor vehicle can be authorised to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle. Having regard to the aforesaid provisions of the MV Act and Rules and the form of permit in form Pst and in the light of the judgment of the Hon: High Court of Kerala in Bhaskaran Vs RTA, Alleppy (2003(1) KLT 106) the application is **rejected**

ITEM NO-22

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant . This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage

carriage with seating capacity 38 in all to operate on the route 4th Block - Thodupuzha Touching West Kodikulam via Manippara, Njarakkadu, Paingottur, Kaloor, Ezhaloor, Perumpallichira, Mangattukavala, Kunnam, Thennathoor and Vazhakala as ordinary service . It is an inter-district route with total route length having 34.4 Kms , out of which 21.4 Kms lies in the jurisdiction of RTA Idukki and 13 kms lies in the jurisdiction of RTA Muvattupuzha . Hence Secretary RTA is directed to seek prior concurrence from RTA Muvattupuzha for the route portion lying within that authority . The applicant is bound to furnish the Registration Mark and other particulars of the vehicle ,offered by him,if any as required by the form PSt SA before the next meeting of this authority . Hence **adjourned**.

ITEM NO-23

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage with seating capacity 38 in all to operate on the route Munnar – Chenduvarai via Mattupetty , Kundala as ordinary service. It is an intra district route with total route length 28 Kms. No overlapping with notified routes. The applicant at the time of hearing today has offered the vehicle KL 38 E 7146 in his name. Hence fresh regular permit is **granted** to stage carriage KL 38 E 7146 on the route Munnar – Chenduvarai as ordinary service subject to settlement of timings. The grantee is directed to produce the current records of the vehicle within 30 days from the date of communication of the decision as per rule 159 (2) of KMV Rules 1989, failing which the grant of the regular permit will be treated as revoked without further notice.

ITEM NO-24

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage to operate on the route Kumily - Nedumkandam Via Anakkara, Puttady, Kochara, Cumbummettu, Balanpillacity, Thookkupalam, Mundiyeeruma, Thannimoodu and Kallar as ordinary service.

The applicant has not , even at the time of hearing in this meeting, 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 authorizing him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and the prescribed form of

permit 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 permits 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 a 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 favor 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 and in the light of the judgment in **Natarajan Vs S T A T (AIR 1999), Kerala, 207** and **Narayanan Vs RTA .Thrissur (Full Bench) 1980 , KLT 249** and **Bhaskaran Vs RTA Alappuzha** application is **adjourned** until after 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 72 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

ITEM NO-25

This is an application, for grant of fresh stage carriage permit on the route Karimanoor School Jn-Thodupuzha Touching Chilavu preferred by Sri Jinto John, Cheruparambil House, West Kodikulam P O, Idukki. The applicant did not appear in person. But the counsel appeared and insisted for the grant of permit. At the same time another person produced a letter stating that, the applicant is at present not in need of the permit. However no ready vehicle being owned by the applicant has been offered. Availability of the ready vehicle duly registered in the name of the applicant is a condition preceded for the grant of permit, as per the judgement in Bhaskaran Vs RTA Alleppy (2003 KHC 13).

The time limit prescribed in Rule 159(2) of KMR is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit is granted on the purpose of making entry of registration mark in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Act and not for facilitating the grantee to procure the ownership of any vehicle after the sanction of the application. Hence **rejected**.

ITEM NO-26

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant . This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage with seating capacity 38 in all to operate on the route Thodupuzha - Kumily Via Mangattukavala, Karikode, Edavetty, Alakkode, Kalayanthani, Velliyamattam, Arakkulam, Moolamattam, Pullikkanam, Vagaman, Elappara, Helibria, Shanthippalam, Chengara, Vellaramkunnu, Chelimada, 1st Mile and Ambalakkavala as Ordinary Service. It is an intra district route with a total route length having 96 Kms . As per the report of the field officer 1.2 Kms from Thodupuzha Municipal Bus stand to More Junction and 3.7 Kms from Arakkulam Kurisupalli to Moolamattam KSRTC overlaps with Kottayam – Kattappana Scheme and 0.1 Kms from Kumily Ambalakkavala to Kumily bus stand overlaps with Kottayam – Thekkady and Ernakulam-Thekkady Scheme.Total overlapping with notified route is 5 kms and **exceeds 5%** of total route length. Hence **Rejected**.

ITEM NO-27

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage to operate on the route Pullikanam – Peermadu Touching Mount Via Vagaman, Elappara, Chappathu, Mlamala, Santhippalam, Vandipperiyar, LIC Junction, Sathram, Manjumala, Parunthumpara and Kallarkavala as Ordinary Service.

The applicant has not , even at the time of hearing in this meeting, 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 authorizing him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and the prescribed form of permit 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 permits 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 a 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 and in the light of the judgement **in Natarajan Vs S T A T (AIR 1999),Kerala,207** and **Narayanan Vs RTA .Thrissur (Full Bench) 1980 , KLT 249** application is **adjourned** until after 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 72 (2)of Motor Vehicles Act.

ITEM NO-28

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage to operate on the route Balanpillacity - Adimaly via Thookkupalam, Nedumkandam, Mavadi, Muniyara, Panickankudy, Kambilikandam and Kallarkutty as ordinary service.

The applicant has not , even at the time of hearing in this meeting, 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 authorizing him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and the prescribed form of permit 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 a 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 favor 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 and in the light of the judgment in **Natarajan Vs S T A T (AIR 1999),Kerala,207** and **Narayanan Vs RTA .Thrissur (Full Bench) 1980 , KLT 249** application is **adjourned** until after 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 72 (2)of Motor Vehicles Act.

ITEM NO-29

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant . This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage with seating capacity 38 in all to operate on the route Munnar - Cherpunkal Medicity via Pallivasal, Anachal, Thokkupara, Ambazhachal, Iruttukanam, Anaviratty, Kumbanpara, Adimaly, Irumbupalam, Neriyaamangalam, Oonnukal, Nellimattam, Kothamangalam centre bus stand, College Jn, Karukadam, Kakkadassery, Muvattupuzha East bus stand, Thottungal peedika, Peringazha, Perumballoor, Arakuzha, Pandappally, Palakuzha, Marika, Kuttikavala, Ambattukandam, Mundunada, Palachuvadu, Methiri, Neeramthanam, Ramapuram panchayath, Ramapuram, Chakkampuzha, Civil station, Hospital Junction, Stadium junction, Pala old bus stand, Kottaramattam bus stand, RV Junction, Marian, Mutholi kavala, Mutholy Kadavu and Cherpunkal church as Ordinary Service. It is an inter district route with total route length having 136.6 Kms , out of which 58.2 Kms lies in the jurisdiction of RTA Idukki , 51.8 kms lies in the jurisdiction of RTA Muvattupuzha and 26.6 kms lies in the jurisdiction of RTA Kottayam . Hence Secretary RTA is directed to seek prior concurrence from RTA Muvattupuzha and Kottayam for the route portion lying within that authority.The applicant is bound to furnish the Registration Mark and other particulars of the vehicle ,offered by him,if any as required by the form PSt SA before the next meeting of this authority . Hence **adjourned**.

ITEM NO-30

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage to operate on the route Thodupuzha - Kattappana Touching Cheruthony Via Gandhi Square, Mangattukavala, Muthalakodam, Njarukutty, Njarukutty-Vandamattam Bypass Vandamattam Church Junction, Kodikkulam,

Kaliyar, Vannappuram, Venmany, Kanjikuzhi, Chelachuvadu, Poomamkandam, Murickassery, Padamugham, Thopramkudy, Prakash, Thankamany, Erattayar, Kattappana and Idukki as Ordinary Service

The applicant has not, even at the time of hearing in this meeting, 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 authorizing him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and the prescribed form of permit 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 a 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 favor 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 and in the light of the judgment in **Natarajan Vs S T A T (AIR 1999), Kerala, 207** and **Narayanan Vs RTA .Thrissur (Full Bench) 1980 , KLT 249** application is **adjourned** until after 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 72 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

ITEM NO-31

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage with seating capacity 38 in all to operate on the route Malayinchil - Chottanikkara via Cheenikuzhy, Kizhakkampadam, Pariyaram, Parakkavala, Udumbanoor, Karimanoor, Njarukutty, Muthalakodam, Thodupuzha, Highrange Hotel Jn, Irakkumpuzha pump Jn, Kolani, Nediyaasala, Iruttuthodu, Vazhithala, Marika, Palakuzha, Koothattukulam, Vadakara, Valiyappadam,

Kakkoor , Anchalpetty , Piravam , Peppathy, Arakkunnam and Mulanthuruthy as Ordinary Service with halt at Thodupuzha. It is an inter district route with total route length having 85.2 Kms , out of which 39.6 Kms lies in the jurisdiction of RTA Idukki , 30.4 kms lies in the jurisdiction of RTA Muvattupuzha and 15.2 kms lies in the jurisdiction of RTA Ernakulam . Hence Secretary RTA is directed to seek prior concurrence from RTA Muvattupuzha and Ernakulam for the route portion lying within that authority .The applicant is bound to furnish the Registration Mark and other particulars of the vehicle ,offered by him,if any as required by the form PSt SA before the next meeting of this authority . Hence **adjourned**.

ITEM NO-32

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage to operate on the route Upputhara - Kumily Touching Nedumkandam Via Parappu, Vellilamkandam, Kanchiyar, Kalthotty, Nariyampara, Kattappana, Puliyanmala, Thookkupalam, Thannimoodu, Chelimada, Vellaramkunnu, Chenkara, Santhippalam and Chappathu as ordinary service

The applicant has not , even at the time of hearing in this meeting, 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 authorizing him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and the prescribed form of permit 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 permits 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 a 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.

Having regard to the aforesaid provisions of the Act and the Rules and in the light of the judgment in **Natarajan Vs S T A T (AIR 1999),Kerala,207** and **Narayanan Vs RTA .Thrissur (Full Bench) 1980 , KLT 249** application is **adjourned** until after 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 72 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

ITEM NO-33

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage to operate on the route Pasuppara - Chenkara Touching Kattappana via Upputhara, Parappu, Marykulam, Swaraj , Vellaramkunnu , Chelimada and Kumily as Ordinary Service.

The applicant has not , even at the time of hearing in this meeting, 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 authorizing him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and the prescribed form of permit 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 permits 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 a 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.

Having regard to the aforesaid provisions of the Act and the Rules and in the light of the judgment in **Natarajan Vs S T A T (AIR 1999),Kerala,207** and **Narayanan Vs RTA .Thrissur (Full Bench) 1980 , KLT 249** application is **adjourned** until after 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 72 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

ITEM NO-34

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage with seating capacity 38 in all to operate on the route Vandiperiyar – Maniyarankudy Via Mlamala, Vallardy, Chenkara, Vellaramkunnu, Anavilasam, Vallakkadavu, Kattappana, Erattayar, Thankamany, Idukki, Cheruthony and Thadiyampadu as Ordinary Service.

The application does not contain the registration number and other particulars of the vehicle for which the permit is sought for. Instead he has offered a 'suitable vehicle' which is not in existence.

At the time of hearing the applicant offered a stage carriage vehicle bearing register number KL 33 C 5112 before this authority as if he had owned the said vehicle. On verification it is found that the said vehicle does not stand registered in the name of the applicant or owned by him. It stands registered in the name of Smt Shobiamma Varghese. The applicant has not produced any proof of his ownership or possession of the vehicle, at the time of hearing. Therefore the applicant is not the owner of this vehicle as required in Section 2 (30) and Section 66(1) of the MV Act 1988.

According to the revised Section 66(1) of the MV Act 1988 no person other than the owner of a motor vehicle can be authorised to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle. Having regard to the aforesaid provisions of the MV Act and Rules and the form of permit in form Pst and in the light of the judgment of the Hon: High Court of Kerala in Bhaskaran Vs RTA, Alleppy (2003(1) KLT 106) the application is **rejected**

ITEM NO-35

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage to operate on the route Kumily - Adimaly via Chelimada, Vellaramkunnu, Anavilasam, Vallakkadavu, Kattappana, Erattayar, Chembakapara, Prakash, Thopramkudy, Padamukam, Murickassery, Kambilikandam and Kallarkutty as Ordinary Service

The applicant has not, even at the time of hearing in this meeting, 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 authorizing him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and the prescribed form of permit 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 permits 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 a 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.

Having regard to the aforesaid provisions of the Act and the Rules and in the light of the judgment in **Natarajan Vs S T A T (AIR 1999), Kerala, 207** and **Narayanan Vs RTA .Thrissur (Full Bench) 1980 , KLT 249** application is **adjourned** until after 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 72 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

ITEM NO-36

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage with seating capacity 33 in all to operate on the route Nedumkandam - Aluva Via Thinkalkkadu, Panickankudy, Kambilikandam, Kallarkutty, Adimaly, Irumbupalam, Neriyaamangalam, Kothamangalam, Perumbavoor and South Vazhakulam as ordinary service. It is an inter district route with total route length having 133 Kms, out of which 73.3 Kms lies in the jurisdiction of RTA Idukki, 47.3 kms lies in the jurisdiction of RTA Muvattupuzha and 12.4 kms lies in the jurisdiction of RTA Ernakulam. Hence Secretary RTA is directed to seek prior concurrence from RTA Muvattupuzha and Ernakulam

for the route portion lying within that authority .The applicant is bound to furnish the Registration Mark and other particulars of the vehicle ,offered by him,if any as required by the form PSt SA before the next meeting of this authority . Hence **adjourned**.

ITEM NO-37

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of new or suitable stage carriage with seating capacity 33 in all to operate on the route Pullikanam – Pasupara Via Chottupara, Wagamon, Kolahalamedu, Vedikuzhy, Elappara, Chemmannu and Kochukarinthiry as Ordinary Service. It is an intra district route with a total route length of 36.7 Kms. No overlapping with notified routes. The applicant at the time of hearing today has offered the vehicle KL 05 V 2143 in his name. Hence fresh regular permit is **granted** to stage carriage KL 05 V 2143 on the route Pullikanam – Pasupara as ordinary service subject to settlement of timings. The grantee is directed to produce the current records of the vehicle within 30 days from the date of communication of the decision as per rule 159 (2) of KMV Rules 1989, failing which the grant of the regular permit will be treated as revoked without further notice.

ITEM NO-38

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage to operate on the route Senapathy - Anachal via Santhanpara, Pooppara, Rajakumary, Rajakkadu and Kunjithanny as Ordinary Service.

The applicant has not , even at the time of hearing in this meeting, 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 authorizing him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and the prescribed form of permit 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 permits 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 a 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.

Having regard to the aforesaid provisions of the Act and the Rules and in the light of the judgment in **Natarajan Vs S T A T (AIR 1999), Kerala, 207** and **Narayanan Vs RTA .Thrissur (Full Bench) 1980 , KLT 249** application is **adjourned** until after 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 72 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

ITEM NO-39

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage to operate on the route Parappu - Kattappana via Mattukatta, Swaraj and Kanchiyar as Ordinary Service .

The applicant has not, even at the time of hearing in this meeting, 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 authorizing him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and the prescribed form of permit 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 permits 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 a 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 favor 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 and in the light of the judgment in **Natarajan Vs S T A T (AIR 1999),Kerala,207** and **Narayanan Vs RTA .Thrissur (Full Bench) 1980 , KLT 249** application is **adjourned** until after 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 72 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

ITEM NO-40

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage to operate on the route Elappara - Kumily Touching Nedumkandam and Kalthotty via Chappathu, Marykulam, Pullumedu, Anavilasam, Vellaramkunnu, Pathumury, 1st mile, Kattappana, Puliyanmala, Thookkupalam, Pachady, Melechinnar, Ettithoppu, Erattayar North and Erattayar as Ordinary service.

The applicant has not, even at the time of hearing in this meeting, 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 authorizing him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and the prescribed form of permit 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 permits 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 a 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 favor 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 and in the light of the judgement **in Natarajan Vs S T A T (AIR 1999),Kerala,207** and **Narayanan Vs RTA .Thrissur (Full Bench) 1980 , KLT 249** application is **adjourned** until after 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 72 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

ITEM NO-41

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage to operate on the route Elappara - Kumily Touching Heliberiya and Kuttikanam via Cheenthalar, Pasupara, Puthukada, Upputhara, Parapu, Marykulam, Pullumedu, Anavilasam, Vellaramkunnu, Chelimada, Chappathu, Chinnar , Kozhikanam and Pallikunnu as Ordinary service

The applicant has not , even at the time of hearing in this meeting, 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 authorizing him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and the prescribed form of permit 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 a 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.

Having regard to the aforesaid provisions of the Act and the Rules and in the light of the judgment **in Natarajan Vs S T A T (AIR 1999),Kerala,207** and **Narayanan Vs RTA .Thrissur (Full Bench) 1980 , KLT 249** application is

adjourned until after 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 72 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

ITEM NO-42

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage to operate on the route Thopramkudy - Thodupuzha via Padamugam, Murickassery, Poomankandam, Periyar valley, Chelachuvadu, Kanjikuzhy, Venmony, Vannappuram, Kaliyar, Kodikulam, Vandamattam church Jn, Vandamattam - Njarukutty Bye pass, Njarukutty, Muthalakodam and Mangattukavala as Ordinary service

The applicant has not, even at the time of hearing in this meeting, 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 authorizing him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and the prescribed form of permit 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 permits 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 a 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 favor 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 and in the light of the judgment in **Natarajan Vs S T A T (AIR 1999), Kerala, 207** and **Narayanan Vs RTA .Thrissur (Full Bench) 1980 , KLT 249** application is **adjourned** until after 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 72 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

ITEM NO-43

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage to operate on the route Adimaly – Munnar touching Rajakkad via Iruttukanam, Anachal, 2nd Mile, Pallivasal, Kunchithanni, Thekkinkanam, Kochupp, PCM Kavala, Valiya mullakkanam as Ordinary Service. The applicant at the time of hearing today has offered the vehicle KL 06 G 2575 in his name. Hence fresh regular permit is **granted** to stage carriage **KL 06 G 2575** on the route Adimaly – Munnar touching Rajakkad as ordinary service subject to settlement of timings. The grantee is directed to produce the current records of the vehicle within 30 days from the date of communication of the decision as per rule 159 (2) of KMV Rules 1989, failing which the grant of the regular permit will be treated as revoked without further notice.

ITEM NO-44

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage to operate on the route Kothapara - Kumily Touching Pasuppara Via Valakodu, Upputhara, Parappu, Chappathu, Santhipalam, Chenkara, Vellaramkunnu, Chelimada, 1st mile, Pathumury, Puttady, Kattappana, Kalthotty, Vellilamkandam and Mattukatta as Ordinary Service.

The applicant has not, even at the time of hearing in this meeting, 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 authorizing him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and the prescribed form of permit 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 a 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 and in the light of the judgment **in Natarajan Vs S T A T (AIR 1999),Kerala,207 and Narayanan Vs RTA .Thrissur (Full Bench) 1980 , KLT 249** application is **adjourned** until after 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 72 (2)of Motor Vehicles Act.

ITEM NO-45

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage to operate on the route Nedumkandam – Thodupuzha via Melechinnar, Murickassery, Chelachuvadu, Vannappuram, Kaliyar, Chalakkamukku, Karimanoor, Kodikulam, Njarukutty, Muthalakodam and Mangattukavala as Ordinary Service.

The applicant has not , even at the time of hearing in this meeting, 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 authorizing him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and the prescribed form of permit 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 a 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 and in the light of the judgment in **Natarajan Vs S T A T (AIR 1999),Kerala,207** and **Narayanan Vs RTA .Thrissur (Full Bench) 1980 , KLT 249** application is **adjourned** until after 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 72 (2)of Motor Vehicles Act.

ITEM NO-46

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant . This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of new or suitable stage carriage with seating capacity 38 in all to operate on the route Kanthalloor - Koviloor Touching Devikulam Via Marayoor, Munnar, Mattupetty,Top station with halt at Marayoor as Ordinary Service..

The application does not contain the registration number and other particulars of the vehicle for which the permit is sought for. Instead he has offered a 'suitable vehicle' which is not in existence.

At the time of hearing the applicant offered a stage carriage vehicle bearing register number KL 37 7724 before this authority as if he had owned the said vehicle. On verification it is found that the said vehicle does not stand registered in the name of the applicant or owned by him.It stands registered in the name of Sri Horbins Sebastian.The applicant has not produced any proof of his ownership or possession of the vehicle, at the time of hearing .Therefore the applicant is not the owner of this vehicle as required in Section 2 (30) and Section 66(1) of the MV Act 1988.

According to the revised Section 66(1) of the MV Act 1988 no person other than the owner of a motor vehicle can be authorised to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle. Having regard to the aforesaid provisions of the MV Act and Rules and the form of permit in form Pst and in the light of the judgment of the Hon: High Court of Kerala in Bhaskaran Vs RTA, Alleppy (2003(1) KLT 106) the application is **rejected**

ITEM NO-47

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant . This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of new or suitable stage carriage with seating capacity 38 in all to operate on the route Odiyapara - Thodupuzha Via Vannappuram, Kaliyar, Kodikkulam, Vandamattam, Kunnam, West Kodikkulam and Vellamchira as Ordinary Service. and having a valid permit on the route Thodupuza-Odiyapara Touching Chalassery .

The application does not contain the registration number and other particulars of the vehicle for which the permit is sought for. Instead he has offered a 'suitable vehicle' which is not in existence.

At the time of hearing the applicant offered a stage carriage vehicle bearing register number KL 38 A 3755 before this authority as if he had owned the said vehicle. On verification it is found that the said vehicle does not stand registered in the name of the applicant or owned by him. It stands registered in the name of Smt Rajani M R and has a valid permit in the route Thodupuzha Odiyapara . The applicant has not produced any proof of his ownership or possession of the vehicle, at the time of hearing .Therefore the applicant is not the owner of this vehicle as required in Section 2 (30) and Section 66(1) of the MV Act 1988.

According to the revised Section 66(1) of the MV Act 1988 no person other than the owner of a motor vehicle can be authorised to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle. Having regard to the aforesaid provisions of the MV Act and Rules and the form of permit in form Pst and in the light of the judgment of the Hon: High Court of Kerala in Bhaskaran Vs RTA, Alleppy (2003(1) KLT 106) the application is **rejected**

ITEM NO-48

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant . This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage with seating capacity 48 in all to operate on the route Muniyara - Thodupuzha Via Panickankudy, Kallarkutty, Adimaly, Neriamangalam, Oonnukal, Kothamangalam, Pothanikadu, Paingottoor and Vengalloor as Ordinary service.

The application does not contain the registration number and other particulars of the vehicle for which the permit is sought for. Instead he has offered a 'suitable vehicle' which is not in existence.

At the time of hearing the applicant offered a stage carriage vehicle bearing register number KL 06 G 1056 before this authority as if he had owned the said vehicle. On verification it is found that the said vehicle does not stand registered in the name of the applicant or owned by him. It stands registered in the name of Sri Liju V S and has a valid permit on the route Muttukad Thodupuzha. The applicant has not produced any proof of his ownership or possession of the vehicle, at the time of hearing. Therefore the applicant is not the owner of this vehicle as required in Section 2 (30) and Section 66(1) of the MV Act 1988.

According to the revised Section 66(1) of the MV Act 1988 no person other than the owner of a motor vehicle can be authorised to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle. Having regard to the aforesaid provisions of the MV Act and Rules and the form of permit in form Pst and in the light of the judgment of the Hon: High Court of Kerala in Bhaskaran Vs RTA, Alleppy (2003(1) KLT 106) the application is **rejected**

ITEM No – 49

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage to operate on the route Thodupuzha - Kumily via Mangattukavala, Anchiri, Anakkayam, Kanjar, Koovappally, Pullikkanam, Vagamon, Valakode, Upputhara, Parappu, Marykulam, Anavilasam, Vellaramkunnu, Pathumuri and 1st mile as ordinary service.

The applicant has not, even at the time of hearing in this meeting, 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 authorizing him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and the prescribed form of permit 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 permits 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 a 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.

Having regard to the aforesaid provisions of the Act and the Rules and in the light of the judgement **in Natarajan Vs S T A T (AIR 1999),Kerala,207 and Narayanan Vs RTA .Thrissur (Full Bench) 1980 , KLT 249** application is **adjourned** until after 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 72 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

ITEM NO-50

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage to operate on the route Kumily - Thodupuzha via 1st mile , Pathumuri , Vellaramkunnu , Anavilasam , Marykulam , Parappu , Upputhara , Valakode , Vagamon , Pullikkanam , Koovappalli , Kanjar , Aanakkayam , Anchiri and Mangattukavala as ordinary service.

The applicant has not , even at the time of hearing in this meeting, 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 authorizing him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and the prescribed form of permit 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 permits 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 a 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.

Having regard to the aforesaid provisions of the Act and the Rules and in the light of the judgement **in Natarajan Vs S T A T (AIR 1999),Kerala,207** and **Narayanan Vs RTA .Thrissur (Full Bench) 1980 , KLT 249** application is **adjourned** until after 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 72 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

ITEM NO-51

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage to operate on the route Kurisupara - Rajakkadu Touching Munnar Via Korangatty,Peechadu, Adimaly, Anachal, Kallarkutty, Vellathooval and Kallar as Ordinary Service.

The applicant has not , even at the time of hearing in this meeting, 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 authorizing him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and the prescribed form of permit 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 permits 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 a 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.

Having regard to the aforesaid provisions of the Act and the Rules and in the light of the judgement in **Natarajan Vs S T A T (AIR 1999),Kerala,207** and **Narayanan Vs RTA .Thrissur (Full Bench) 1980 , KLT 249** application is **adjourned** until after 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 72 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

ITEM NO-52

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage with seating capacity 38 in all to operate on the route Kattappana – Rajakumary Via Thookkupalam, Puliyanmala, Thannimoodu, Nedumkandam, Chemmannar, Erattayar, Thovala, Anchumukku and Pampadumpara as Ordinary Service.

The applicant has not, even at the time of hearing in this meeting, 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 authorizing him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and the prescribed form of permit 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 a 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.

Having regard to the aforesaid provisions of the Act and the Rules and in the light of the judgment in **Natarajan Vs S T A T (AIR 1999),Kerala,207** and **Narayanan Vs RTA .Thrissur (Full Bench) 1980 , KLT 249** application is **adjourned** until after 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 72 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

ITEM NO-53

Heard. Applicant was absent. This is a request for granting maximum time for production of current records in respect of the application for fresh stage carriage permit on the route Kumily-Kattappana touching Cumbummettu via Anavilasam, Amayar, Puttady, Anakkara and Chettukuzhy as Ordinary Service. RTA held on 17/08/2023 vide item no 5 considered the application and fresh regular permit was granted to a suitable stage carriage with seating capacity 48 in all subject to settlement of timings. The grantee is directed to produce the current records of the vehicle within 30 days from the date of communication of the decision as per rule 159 (2) of KMV Rules 1989, failing which the grant of the regular permit will be treated up as revoked without further notice. Decision was communicated to the applicant on 09/10/2023 and the applicant has requested for granting maximum time for production of current records as per rule 159 (2) of KMV Rules 1989. Four months maximum time for production of current records expired on 08/02/2024. But the grantee has failed to produce records of the vehicle within the maximum time limit as per rule 159 (2) of KMV Rules 1989. The grantee has failed to produce the Registration Certificate and other particulars offered by him, even after the lapse 10 months, from the date of communication of the decision. The delay occurred has not been explained by the grantee. Therefore the request for further extension of time is declined. Secretary RTA will initiate action for revocation of the permit granted.

ITEM NO-54

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is a request for granting maximum time for production of current records in respect of the application for fresh stage carriage permit on the route Koviloor-Munnar via Top station, Ellapetty, Kundala and Mattupetty as ordinary service. RTA held on 17/08/2023 vide item no 21 considered the application and fresh regular permit was granted to a suitable stage carriage with seating capacity 48 in all subject to settlement of timings. The grantee is directed to produce the current records of the vehicle within 30 days from the date of communication of the decision as per rule 159 (2) of KMV Rules 1989, failing which the grant of

the regular permit will be treated up as revoked without further notice.

Decision was communicated to the applicant on 09/10/2023 and the applicant has requested for granting maximum time for production of current records as per rule 159 (2) of KMV Rules 1989 . Four months maximum time for production of current records expired on 08/02/2024. But the grantee has failed to produce records of the vehicle within the maximum time limit as per rule 159 (2) of KMV Rules 1989 . But the grantee has not produced Registration certificate and other documents of the vehicle within the maximum time limit as per rule 159 (2) of KMV Rules 1989 .He has on 22/08/2024,produced the Registration Certificate and other particulars of stage carriage bearing number KL 35 G 4820 which is not owned by him.There fore he has no registered on transferred in his name .Taking into account the non availability of a vehicle and in ordinate delay of 10 months for production of the above records ,hence request for extension of time for production of current records is **rejected** .Secretary will initiate the action for revocation of permit granted .

ITEM NO-55

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is a request for granting maximum time for production of current records in respect of the application for fresh stage carriage permit on the route Kumily - Nedumkandam Touching Pooppara Via Anakkara, Chellarcoil ,Myladumpara, Kochara, Cumbummettu, Karunapuram, Balanpillacity, Thookkupalam, Mundiyeruma, Thannimmodu, Nedumkandam, Parathodu, Udumbanchola, Chathurangapara and Santhanpara as Ordinary Service.RTA held on 17/08/2023 vide item no 29 considered the application and fresh regular permit was granted to a suitable stage carriage with seating capacity 38 in all subject to settlement of timings. The grantee is directed to produce the current records of the vehicle within 30 days from the date of communication of the decision as per rule 159 (2) of KMV Rules 1989, failing which the grant of the regular permit will be treated up as revoked without further notice. The decision was communicated to the applicant on 09/10/2023 and the applicant has requested for granting maximum time for production of current records as per rule 159 (2) of KMV Rules 1989 . Four months maximum time for production of current records expired on 08/02/2024. But the grantee has failed to produce records of the vehicle within the maximum time limit as per rule 159 (2) of KMV Rules 1989 .

Therefore the request for further extension of time is declined .Secretary RTA will initiate action for revocation of the permit granted .

ITEM NO-56

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is a request for granting maximum time for production of current records in respect of the application for fresh stage carriage permit on the route Kattappana-Rajakkadu via Erattayar, Thoivala, Anchumukku, Kavunthy, Nedumkandam, Udumbanchola, Chemmannar, Mangathotty and Rajakumary. RTA held on 17/08/2023 vide item no 30 considered the application and fresh regular permit was granted to a suitable stage carriage with seating capacity 38 in all subject to settlement of timings. The grantee is directed to produce the current records of the vehicle within 30 days from the date of communication of the decision as per rule 159 (2) of KMV Rules 1989, failing which the grant of the regular permit will be treated up as revoked without further notice. The decision was communicated to the applicant on 09/10/2023 and the applicant has requested for granting maximum time for production of current records as per rule 159 (2) of KMV Rules 1989 . Four months maximum time for production of current records expired on 08/02/2024. But the grantee has failed to produce records of the vehicle within the maximum time limit as per rule 159 (2) of KMV Rules 1989 .Therefore the request for further extension of time is declined .Secretary RTA will initiate action for revocation of the permit granted .

ITEM NO-57

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is a request for granting maximum time for production of current records in respect of the application for fresh stage carriage permit on the route Murickssery-Thodupuzha Touching Nedumkandam Via Poomankandam, Chelachuvadu, Kanjikkuzhy, Pazhayarikandam, Venmany, Vannappuram, Kaliyar, Vandamattam, Mangattukavala, New KSRTC Stand, Perinjankutty, Melechinnar and Pachady. RTA held on 17/08/2023 vide item no 32 considered the application and fresh regular permit was granted to a suitable stage carriage with seating capacity 38 in all subject to settlement of timings. The grantee is directed to produce the current records of the vehicle within 30 days from the date of communication of the decision as per rule 159 (2) of KMV Rules 1989, failing which the grant of the regular permit will be treated up as revoked

without further notice. The decision was communicated to the applicant on 09/10/2023 and the applicant has requested for granting maximum time for production of current records as per rule 159 (2) of KMV Rules 1989 . On 01/02/2024 the applicant has requested to issue the granted permit to stage carriage KL 02 T 5290 in his name, within the maximum time for production of current records as per rule 159 (2) of KMV Rules 1989 . Seating capacity of KL 02 T 5290 is 48 in all and fresh permit is granted to stage carriage with seating capacity 38 in all. Request of the applicant for granting maximum time for production of current records is **granted**.

ITEM NO-58

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is a request for granting maximum time for production of current records in respect of the application for fresh stage carriage permit on the route Kanthalloor-Adimaly Touching Devikulam Via Marayoor, Munnar, 2nd Mile, Anachal and Iruttukanam. RTA held on 17/08/2023 vide item no 23 considered the application and fresh regular permit was granted to a suitable stage carriage with seating capacity 38 in all subject to settlement of timings. The grantee is directed to produce the current records of the vehicle within 30 days from the date of communication of the decision as per rule 159 (2) of KMV Rules 1989, failing which the grant of the regular permit will be treated up as revoked without further notice. Decision was communicated to the applicant on 09/10/2023 and the applicant has requested for granting maximum time for production of current records as per rule 159 (2) of KMV Rules 1989 . Four months maximum time for production of current records expired on 08/02/2024. Hence extension of time by one month to produce the Registration certificate and other records, is allowed from the date of communication of this decision. No further extension will be allowed .

ITEM NO-59

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is a request for granting maximum time for production of current records in respect of stage carriage KL 17 T 3501 for the renewal of permit application for further period of 5 years from 01/11/2017 to 31/10/2022 and from 01/11/2022 to 31/10/2027 and the variation of permit application on the route Munnar-Vyttila Bus Terminal by curtailing the route portion from Kanthalloor to Munnar. RTA held on 17/08/2023 vide item no 45 considered the applications.

Renewal of permit and variation of permit was granted to Munnar-Vyttila Bus Terminal as ordinary service with existing timings . The grantee is directed to produce the current records of the vehicle within 30 days from the date of communication of the decision, failing which the sanction will be liable to be revoked without further notice. Decision was communicated to the applicant on 08/10/2023 and the applicant has requested for granting maximum time for production of current records on 31/10/2023 . Four months maximum time for production of current records expired on 07/02/2024. . Hence extension of time by one month to produce the Registration certificate and other records, is allowed from the date of communication of this decision. No further extension will be allowed .

ITEM NO-60

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is a request for granting maximum time for production of current records in respect of stage carriage KL 68 A 3770 for the renewal of permit application for further period of 5 years from 19/01/2020 and the variation of permit application on the route Munnar-Aluva via Anachal, Adimaly, Kothamangalam and Perumbavoor . RTA held on 17/08/2023 vide item no 48 considered the applications. Renewal of permit and variation of permit was granted as Munnar-Aluva with halt at Munnar as ordinary service with existing timings without allowing additional trips . The grantee is directed to produce the current records of the vehicle within 30 days from the date of communication of the decision, failing which the sanction will be liable to be revoked without further notice. Decision was communicated to the applicant on 09/10/2023 and the applicant has requested for granting maximum time for production of current records on 09/11/2023 . Four months maximum time for production of current records expired on 08/02/2024. . Hence extension of time by one month to produce the Registration certificate and other records, is allowed from the date of communication of this decision. No further extension will not be allowed .

ITEM NO-61

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for renewal of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 38 F 3177 permitted to conduct service on the route Thodupuzha - Nedumkandam via Vengaloor, Kaloor, Oonnukal, Neriyaamangalam, Adimaly,

Kallarkutty, Ponmudy, Rajakkadu, Pooppara by deviating the route from Panniyarkutty to Chelachuvadu via Kaltharakuzhy as Limited Stop Ordinary Service. Total route length is 136 kms. Permit is issued prior to 14/07/2009. As per clause 4, GO(P) No 13/2023/TRANS dated 03/05/2023, the existing valid regular permits in 14/07/2009 in operation with trips and vehicles of the private stage carriages will be permitted to operate as Ordinary Service only. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant has intimated that WP© No 20914/2024 is pending before Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in connection with renewal of permit as Limited Stop Ordinary Service. Hence renewal of permit application is **adjourned** till the disposal WP© No 20914/2024 of Hon'ble High Court of Kerala.

ITEM NO-62

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for renewal of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 33 Q 3325 permitted to conduct service on the route Kottayam – Balanpillacity Via Pampady, 14th Mile, Ponkunnam, Mundakkayam, Kuttikkanam, Elappara, Kattappana, Puliyanmala, Balagram and Thookkupalam as Limited Stop Ordinary Service. Total route length is 136 kms. Permit is issued prior to 14/07/2009. As per Clause 4, GO(P) No 13/2023/TRANS dated 03/05/2023 the existing valid regular permits in 14/07/2009 in operation with trips and vehicles of the private stage carriages will be permitted to operate as Ordinary Service only. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant has intimated that WP© No 29579/2024 is pending before Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in connection with renewal of permit as Limited Stop Ordinary Service. Hence renewal of permit application is **adjourned** till the disposal WP© No 29579/2024 of Hon'ble High Court of Kerala.

ITEM NO-63

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for renewal of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 33 J 3893 permitted to conduct service on the route Mavelikkara - Kumily Via Munnar, Parumala, Kavumbhagam, Idinjillam, Changanacherry, 14th Mile, Ponkunnam, Mundakkayam, Peermade and Vandiperiyar as Limited Stop Ordinary Service. Total route length is 138 kms. Permit is issued prior to 14/07/2009. As per Clause 4, GO(P) No 13/2023/TRANS dated 03/05/2023 the existing valid regular permits in 14/07/2009 in operation with trips and vehicles

of the private stage carriages will be permitted to operate as Ordinary Service only. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant has intimated that WP© No 27776/2024 is pending before Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in connection with renewal of permit as Limited Stop Ordinary Service . Hence renewal of permit application is **adjourned** till the disposal WP© No 27776/2024 of Hon'ble High Court of Kerala

ITEM NO-64

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for renewal of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 38 G 4840 permitted to conduct service on the route Odiyapara - Kanjirapally via Vannappuram, Kaliyar, Vandamattam, Thodupuzha, Muttam, Melukavu, Erattupetta and Thidanadu as Ordinary Service. Total route length is 68.8 kms, out of which 34.5 kms in the jurisdiction of RTA Idukki and 34.3 kms in the jurisdiction of RTA Kottayam . Permit is issued prior to 14/07/2009. The permit holder failed to produce the NOC from the financier ,M/s Federal Bank Vannappuram. Hence **Adjourned**.

ITEM NO-65

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant.

1. This is an application for renewal of regular permit in respect stage carriage KL 37 E 1284 permitted to conduct service on the route Nedumkandam - Kottaym via Thookkupalam, Puliyanmala, Kattappana, Elappara, Mundakayam, Ponkunnam and Pampady as Limited Stop Ordinary Service . Total route length is 139 kms, out of which 86 kms in the jurisdiction of RTA Idukki and 53 kms in the jurisdiction of RTA Kottayam . Permit is issued prior to 14/07/2009. The applicant did not produce the NOC from the Financier M/s Cholamandalam Investments and Finance ,Kottayam . Hence the application for renewal is **adjourned** .

2. . Transfer of permit is **adjourned for want of production of NOC** from the financier.

ITEM NO-66

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant.

1.This is an application for renewal of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 05 W 1308 permitted to conduct service on the route West

Kodikulam-Thodupuzha via Vazhakala, Kallampally, Ezhaloor and Perumpallichira as Ordinary Service .Permit is issued after 14/07/2009. The total route length is 14.4 kms. 1.2 kms from Thodupuzha Bus stand to KSRTC Stand overlaps with Kottayam-Kattappana Scheme.Renewal is adjourned along with application for variation of permit.

2. This is an application for variation of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 05 W 1308 permitted to conduct service on the route West Kodikulam - Thodupuzha via Vazhakala, Kallampally, Ezhaloor and Perumpallichira As Koduvely Sangathimukku - Thodupuzha via Koduvely, Chalakkamukku , Vellamchira, West Kodikulam, Vazhakala, Kallampally ,Kodikulam, Ezalloor, Perumballichira and Mangattukavala and as ordinary service. The variation applied is for extension of service to Sangathimukku which is an interior palace. The only trip proposed to this place shows that this vehicle arrives at 1.23 pm and depart at 1.35.This will not be useful for traveling public. Hence adjourned with a direction to the applicant to modify the time schedule so as to provide more connectivity to this place.

ITEM NO-67

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant.

1. The stage carriage KL 33 H 805 is permitted to conduct service on the route Changanachery – Nedumkandam (via) Karukachal , 14th mile , Ponkunnam, Mundakkayam, Kuttikkanam, Elappara. Kattappana, Puliyanmala and Vattappara and return via Vattappara,Kattappana, Elappara, Mundakkayam, Ponkunnam, 14th mile, Pampady, Kottayam, Mulakuzha, Pakkil, Chingavanam, Anachalkutty and Thuruty as Limited Stop Ordinary Service. This is an application for variation by curtailing the route portion from Ponkunnam to Changanachery as Limited Stop Ordinary Service.Total route length is 179 kms and route length after proposed

variation becomes 104 kms. The Curtailed portion of the route is lying within the jurisdiction of RTA Kottayam .HenceSecretary RTA is directed to seek prior concurrence from RTA Kottayam for the route portion lying within that authority. Hence **adjourned**.

2. This is an application for renewal of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 33 H 805 permitted to conduct service on the route Changanassery – Nedumkandam as Limited Stop Ordinary Service, for a further period of 5 Years from 26/04/2021 to 25/04/2026. The total route length is 179

kms . Since Concurrence of RTA Kottayam has been called for variation of the route by curtailment ,the matter is Adjourned.

ITEM NO-68

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant.

1. The stage carriage KL 69 B 4262 is permitted to conduct service on the route Puthenthodu - Pooppara via Vaikom, Thalayolaparambu, Peruva, Mulakulam, Piravam, Anchalpetty, Muvattupuzha, Kothamangalam, Neriyaamangalam, Adimaly Kallarkutty and Rajakkadu .This is an application for variation of regular permit on the route Thalayolaparambu - Pooppara by curtailing the route portion from Puthenthodu to Thalayolaparambu as Limited Stop Ordinary Service..Total route length is 156.9 kms and route length after variation becomes 137.8 kms. As per Sl no 4 of GO(P) No 13/2023/TRANS dated 03/05/2023 the existing valid regular permits as on 14/07/2009, will be permitted to operate as Ordinary Service if route length not exceeds 140 kms. The proposed curtailment of the route is lying within the jurisdiction of RTA Kottayam .Hence Secretary RTA is directed to seek prior concurrence from RTA Kottayam for the route portion lying within that authority. Hence **adjourned.**

2. This is an application for renewal of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 69 B 4262 permitted to conduct service on the route Thalayolaparambu - Pooppara as Limited Stop Ordinary Service for a further period of 5 years from 12/12/2014 to 11/12/2019 and 12/12/2019 to 11/12/2024. The total route length is 156.9 kms . Since Concurrence of RTA Kottayam has been called for variation of the route by curtailment ,the matter is **Adjourned.**

ITEM NO-69

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant.

1.This is an application for renewal of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 08 AH 3795 permitted to conduct service on the route Vazhakulam-Muthalakodam via Arikuzha and Thodupuzha as Ordinary Service . Total route length is 19.5 kms. 1.2 kms from Thodupuzha Bus stand to KSRTC Stand overlaps with Kottayam-Kattappana Scheme. This permit is issued prior to 14/07/2009. The Judgement in WP© No 26595/2025 dated

25/07/2024 of Hon,ble High Court of Kerala , there was a direction to consider the application for renewal of permit expeditiously and If the renewal is granted ,the application for replacement of the vehicle should also be considered within two months. Hence renewal of permit in respect of stage carriage KL 08 AH 3795 permitted to conduct service on the route Vazhakulam-Muthalakodam via Arikuzha and Thodupuzha is granted as Ordinary Service subject to clearance of government dues.

2. This is an application for replacement of stage carriage KL 08 AH 3795 with KL 07 BB 9848 permitted to conduct service on the route Vazhakulam-Muthalakodam via Arikuzha and Thodupuzha as Ordinary Service. Secretary RTA is directed to allow replacement of the vehicle KL 08 AH 3795 with a suitable later model vehicle after renewal of the permit.

ITEM NO-70

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant.

1. Delay condoned in submitting the renewal of regular permit application in respect of stage carriage KL 44 A 2599 for the period from 19/02/2023 to 18/02/2028.

2.The Stage carriage KL 44 A 2599 was permitted to conduct service on the route Santhanpara - Mundakayam (via) Rajakkad, Ponmudy, Kallarkutty, Adimaly, Neriyaamangalam, Oonnukal, Paingottoor, Kaloar, Thodupuzha, Erattupetta, Kanjirappally and Return Trip (via) Kanjirappally, Erattupetta, Muttom, Thodupuzha, Vazhakkulam, Muvattupuzha , Kothamangalam, Adimaly, Kallarkutty, Ponmudy and Rajakkad as Limited Stop Ordinary Service. This is an application for variation of permit on the route Santhanpara- Thodupuzha via Rajakkad, Ponmudy, Kallarkutty, Adimaly, Neriyaamangalam, Oonnukal, Paingottoor and Kaloar by curtailing the route portion from Thodupuzha to Mundakayam and deviating the return trip from Thodupuzha to Adimaly via Kaloar and Paingottoor and one additional trip from Adimaly to Kothamangalam as Limited Stop Ordinary Service. Total route length is 212 kms and route length after proposed variation becomes 119 kms. As per GO(P) No 13/2023/TRANS dated 03/05/2023 the existing valid regular permits prior to 14/07/2009 in operation, will be permitted to operate as Ordinary Service only, if the route length does not exceed 140 km. The proposed variation includes one additional trip from Adimaly to Kothamangalam and from Vengaloar to Oonnukal , a portion of this additional route comes under the jurisdiction of RTA Muvattupuzha . Similarly a portion

of the proposed Curtailment is between Thodupuzha na Mundakkayam ,is coming under the jurisdiction of RTA Kottayam . Hence Secretary RTA is directed to seek prior concurrence from RTA Muvattupuzha and RT A Kottayam for the route portion lying within the respective authorities . Hence **adjourned**.

3. This application for renewal of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 44 A 2599 permitted to conduct service on the route Santhanpara - Mundakayam (via) Rajakkad, Ponmudy, Kallarkutty, Adimaly, Neriya Mangalam, Oonnukal, Paingottoor, Kaloore, Thodupuzha, Erattupetta, Kanjirappally and Return Trip (via) Kanjirappally, Erattupetta, Muttom, Thodupuzha, Vazhakkulam, Muvattupuzha , Kothamangalam, Adimaly, Kallarkutty, Ponmudy and Rajakkad as Limited Stop Ordinary Service is also **adjourned**.

4. Transfer of permit (Death) is also **adjourned** until the permit is renewed.

ITEM NO-71

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant.

1. Perused the Judgment in WP© No.27293/2024 dated 31/07/2024 of Hon'ble High court of Kerala

2. The stage carriage KL 33 L 2862 **is** permitted to conduct service on the route Kottaym-Ramakkalmedu via Ponkunnam, Mundakayam, Kuttikkanam, Elappara, Kattappana and Nedumkandam as Limited Stop Ordinary Service .This is an application for variation of regular permit on the route Kottaym-Nedumkandam via Ponkunnam, Mundakayam, Kuttikkanam, Elappara , Kattappana and Vattappara by curtailing the portion from Nedumkandam to Ramakkalmedu as Limited Stop Ordinary Service. Total route length is 149 kms and route length after variation becomes 137 kms. As per GO(P) No 13/2023/TRANS dated 03/05/2023 the existing valid regular permits 14/07/2009 in operation with trips, stage carriages will be permitted to operate as Ordinary Service, if the route length does not exceed 140 kms. Hence variation of permit is **granted** on the route Kottaym-Nedumkandam,by curtailing the portion from Nedumkandam to Ramakkalmedu, via Ponkunnam, Mundakayam, Kuttikkanam, Elappara , Kattappana and Vattappara as ordinary service with the existing timings.

3. This is an application for renewal of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 33 L 2862 permitted to conduct service on the route Kottaym-Ramakkalmedu via Ponkunnam, Mundakayam, Kuttikkanam, Elappara, Kattappana and Nedumkandam as Limited Stop Ordinary Service for a further period of 5 years from 09/09/2024. Total route length is 149 kms . NOC from finance Company not produced . The Application for Variation of Permit by curtailment between Nedumkandam and Ramakkalmedu, to reduce the Route length below is adjourned for want of production of NOC from finance Company .

4. Transfer of permit **is adjourned for want of production of NOC** from the financer.

ITEM NO-72

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. Decision adjourned since application for renewal of permit has not come up for consideration along with request for issuance of clearance certificate. Secretary will ensure whether any application for variation of permit by curtailment so as to reduce the route length below 140 Kms has been received from the permit holder. More over, the impact of order of the STAT in MVARP No MVARP No.171/2017 dated 29/04/2023 needs to be addressed immediately.

ITEM NO-73

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant.

1.The Stage carriage KL 17 M 1684 was permitted to conduct service on the route Kanthaloor - Aluva (Via) Marayoor, Munnar, Adimaly, Kothamangalam, Perumbavoor and South Vazhakulam as Limited Stop Ordinary Service. This is an application for variation of permit on the route Kanthaloor - Kothamangalam (Via) Munnar and Adimaly by curtailing the route portion from Kothamangalam to Aluva and one additional trip from Kothamangalam to Adimaly and vice versa as Limited Stop Ordinary Service . Total route length is 169 kms and route length after variation becomes 134 kms. As per SI no 4 of GO(P) No 13/2023/TRANS dated 03/05/2023 the existing valid regular permits in 14/07/2009, will be permitted to operate as Ordinary Service. if the route length does not exceed 140 kms. Since the curtailment of existing route as well as additional trips are lying within the jurisdiction of RTA Ernakulam and

Muvattupuzha , Secretary RTA is directed to seek concurrence of that RTA's . Hence variation of regular permit is **Adjourned**.

2. This is an application for renewal of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 17 M 1684 permitted to conduct service on the route Kanthalloor - Aluva (Via) Marayoor, Munnar, Adimaly, Kothamangalam, Perumbavoor and South Vazhakulam as Limited Stop Ordinary Service. The application for curtailment to reduce the route length below 140 km is adjourned ,Hence this application for renewal also adjourned.

ITEM NO-74

Applicant absent. Hence adjourned.

ITEM NO-75

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for renewal of regular permit in respect stage carriage KL 07 BX 9686 permitted to conduct service on the route Munnar-Aluva (Via) Anachal, Adimaly, Kothamangalam, Perumbavoor and South Vazhakkulam as Limited Stop Ordinary Service . Total route length is 116.2 kms .Total overlapping with notified route is below 5% of total route length. Hence renewal of permit is **granted** on the route Munnar-Aluva (Via) Anachal, Adimaly, Kothamangalam, Perumbavoor and South Vazhakkulam as Ordinary Service subject to clearance of government dues,if any .

ITEM NO-76

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant.

1 . This is an application for renewal of regular permit in respect stage carriage KL 33 C 9978 permitted to conduct service on the route Chempakappara - Chengnacherry (Via) Ezhukumvayal, Erattayar, Kattappana, Elappara, Mundakkayam, Ponkunnam,14th Mile and Karukachal as Limited Stop Ordinary Service . The total route length is 132 kms . Permit is issued prior to 14/07/2009. Earlier Clearance Certificate was issued in respect of this vehicle,in obedience to the Judgment in WPC No 12959/2015 dated 28/04/2015 and thereafter the vehicle was replaced to a later model vehicle KL 58 E 1899. Hence renewal of permit is **granted** on the route Chempakappara - Chengnacherry (Via) Ezhukumvayal, Erattayar, Kattappana, Elappara,

Mundakkayam, Ponkunnam, 14th Mile and Karukachal as Ordinary Service subject to clearance of government dues ,if any.

2. Transfer of permit granted as applied for subject to clearance of all Government dues if any.

ITEM NO-77

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for renewal of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 33 K 6700 permitted to conduct service on the route Chengnacherry - Nedumkandam (Via) Karukachal, Ponkunnam, Mundakkayam, Elappara, Kattappana and Balagram. The total route length is 138 kms. Permit is issued prior to 14/07/2009. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant has submitted that WP© No 27947/2024 is pending before Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in connection with renewal of permit as Limited Stop Ordinary Service . Hence renewal of permit application is **adjourned** till the disposal WP© No 27947/2024 of Hon'ble High Court of Kerala.

ITEM NO-78

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for renewal of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 63 9461 permitted to conduct service on the route Mankuva-Thodupuzha (Via) Kambilikandam, Kallarkutty, Adimali, Neriyaamangalam, Oonnukal, Paingottoor, Kumaramangalam and Vengalloor as Ordinary Service. Total route length is 86.6 kms . Permit is issued prior to 14/07/2009. Renewal of permit **granted as Ordinary Service** subject to clearance of government dues,if any.

ITEM NO-79

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for renewal of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 38 F 6377 permitted to conduct service on the route Pala - Senapathy Via Kollappally, Karimkunnam, Thodupuzha, Vengalloor, Kaloore ,Paingottoor, Oonnukal, Neriyaamangalam, Adimaly, Kallarkutty ,Vellathooval, Kalathrakuzhy, Rajakadu and Santhanpara as Limited Stop Ordinary Service. The total route length is 136.2 kms. Permit is issued prior to 14/07/2009. The learned counsel has submitted that WP© No 21405 /2024 is pending before Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in connection with renewal of permit as Limited

Stop Ordinary Service . Hence renewal of permit application is **adjourned** till the disposal WP© No 21405/2024 of Hon'ble High Court of Kerala.

ITEM NO-80

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant.

1. Delay Condonation in submitting the application for renewal of regular permit application in respect of stage carriage KL 68 A 7616, permitted to conduct service on the route Adimaly-Irumpupalam Via Machiplavu and 14th Mile as Ordinary Service, is granted.
2. This is an application for renewal of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 68 A 7616 permitted to conduct service on the route Adimaly-Irumpupalam Via Machiplavu and 14th Mile as Ordinary Service. The total route length is 10.5 kms . No overlapping with notified routes. Renewal of permit **granted** as Ordinary Service subject to clearance of government dues,if any.

ITEM NO-81

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for renewal of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 35 J 9156 permitted to conduct service on the route Balanpillacity - Kottayam (Via) Thookkupalam, Balagram, Kattappana, Elappara, Kuttikkanam, Mundakkayam, Ponkunnam, Kidangoor, 14th Mile and Pampady as Ordinary Service. The total route length is 136 kms . Permit is issued prior to 14/07/2009. Renewal of permit as Ordinary Service is **adjourned** for want of production of NOC from finance company.

ITEM NO-82

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant.

1. Delay condonation in submitting the renewal of regular permit application in respect of stage carriage KL 17 D 6768 permitted to conduct service on the route Keerithodu -Maniyarankudy Touching Cheruthoni and Vannappuram (Via) Chelachuvadu, Thadiyampadu, Vazhathope, Pazhayarikandam, Venmony and Mundanmudy as Ordinary Service, is granted.
2. This is an application for renewal of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 17 D 6768 permitted to conduct service on the route Keerithodu -Maniyarankudy Touching Cheruthoni and Vannappuram (Via)

Chelachuvadu, Thadiyampadu, Vazhathope, Pazhayarikandam, Venmony and Mundanmudy as Ordinary Service. The total route length is 54.5 kms . No overlapping with notified routes. Applicant failed to produce NOC from Fiance Company. Renewal of permit **adjourned** for want of production of NOC.

ITEM NO-83

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant.

1. Delay condonation in submitting the renewal of regular permit application in respect of stage carriage KL 69 B 8493 permitted to conduct service on the route Bisonvalley - Kothamangalam (Via) Rajakkadu, Kunjithanny, Ellackal, Anachal, Adimaly, Neriyaamangalam as Ordinary Service, is granted.

2. This is an application for renewal of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 69 B 8493 permitted to conduct service on the route Bisonvalley - Kothamangalam (Via) Rajakkadu, Kunjithanny, Ellackal, Anachal, Adimaly, Neriyaamangalam as Ordinary Service. Total route length is 83.1 kms . No overlapping with notified routes. **Renewal of permit is adjourned** for want of production of NOC from finance company.

ITEM NO-84

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant

1. This is an application for variation of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 33 B 2316 permitted to conduct service on the route Murickassery-Nedumkandam via Thopramkudy, Prakash, Thankamany, Erattayar, Kattappana, Chempalam and Pampadumpara by curtailing the morning and evening trips between Thankamany and Muruckassery and changing the halting place as Thankamany. The variation applied involves curtailment of trips and change in halting places with significant changes in the existing time schedule .It appears that the application is made for seeking revision of existing timings without any reason Whatsoever no circumstances enumerated in Kerala Motor Vehicles Rule 145(6) has arisen in this case warranting any variation in the existing route .Therefore the application for **variation is rejected** .

2. Transfer of permit is **permitted** subject to the condition that the vehicle shall be operated as Ordinary Service .

ITEM NO-85

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. Transfer of permit is **permitted** subject to the condition that the vehicle shall be operated as Ordinary Service .

ITEM NO-86

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. Transfer of permit is **permitted** subject to the condition that the vehicle shall be operated as Ordinary Service .

ITEM NO-87

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. The applicant has produced the NOC from the finance Company on 12/08/2024 . Transfer of permit is **permitted** subject to the condition that the vehicle shall be operated as Ordinary Service .

ITEM NO-88

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. Transfer of permit is **permitted** subject to the condition that the vehicle shall be operated as Ordinary Service .

ITEM NO-89

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. The applicant failed to produce the NOC from the finance Company . Transfer of permit **adjourned for want of** production of NOC.

ITEM NO-90

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. The applicant failed to produce the NOC from the finance Company . Transfer of permit **adjourned for want of** production of NOC.

ITEM NO-91

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. The applicant failed to produce the NOC from the finance Company . Transfer of permit **adjourned for want of** production of NOC.

ITEM NO-92

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. The applicant has produced the NOC from the finance Company on 14/08/2024 . Transfer of permit is **permitted** subject to the condition that the vehicle shall be operated as Ordinary Service .

ITEM NO-93

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. Transfer of permit is **permitted** subject to the condition that the vehicle shall be operated as Ordinary Service .

ITEM NO-94

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. The applicant failed to produce the NOC from the finance Company . Transfer of permit **adjourned for want of** production of NOC.

ITEM NO-95

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. Transfer of permit is **permitted** subject to the condition that the vehicle shall be operated as Ordinary Service .

ITEM NO-96

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. The applicant failed to produce the NOC from the finance Company . Transfer of permit **adjourned for want of** production of NOC.

ITEM NO-97

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. The applicant failed to produce the NOC from the finance Company . Transfer of permit **adjourned for want of** production of NOC.

ITEM NO-98

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. The applicant failed to produce the NOC from the finance Company . Transfer of permit **adjourned for want of** production of NOC.

ITEM NO-99

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. The applicant failed to produce the NOC from the finance Company . Transfer of permit **adjourned for want of** production of NOC.

ITEM NO-100

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. Transfer of permit is **permitted** subject to the condition that the vehicle shall be operated as Ordinary Service .

ITEM NO-101

Heard. The Permit holder Sri Binu John objected to the transfer of permit,when the item was considered.The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the 2nd applicant. The permit is on the route Thankamany - Kottayam Via Erattayar, Kattappana, Elappara, Mundakkayam, Ponkunnam, 14th Mile and Pampady as Limited Stop Ordinary Service vide permit no KL66/86/1972 , held by Sri Binu John and the stage carriage KL 05 AR 5061 is attached to the permit on the basis of lease agreement executed on 17/ 08/2022 between the permit holder Sri Binu John and Sri Sabu Jacob,the owner of the vehicle. On 26/09/2023 a joint application was filed before Secretary RTA .In this connection all the parties including the permit holder Sri Binu John appeared before Secretary RTA , for personal hearing and all the parties affixed signature in front of Secretary RTA on 05/10/2023.Since permit holder objected the proposed transfer of permit the item is **rejected**.

ITEM NO-102

Heard. The learned counsels appeared on behalf of the applicants. Transfer of permit is **permitted** subject to the condition that the vehicle shall be operated as Ordinary Service .

ITEM NO-103

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. The applicant failed to produce the NOC from the finance Company . Transfer of permit **adjourned for want of** production of NOC.

ITEM NO-104

Repetition of Item no 102.

ITEM NO-105

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. The applicant failed to produce the NOC from the finance Company . Transfer of permit **adjourned for want of** production of NOC.

ITEM NO-106

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. The applicant failed to produce the NOC from the finance Company . Transfer of permit is **adjourned for want of** production of NOC.

ITEM NO-107

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. Transfer of permit is **permitted** subject to the condition that the vehicle shall be operated as Ordinary Service .

ITEM NO-108

Heard. The learned counsels appeared on behalf of the applicants. Transfer of permit is **permitted** subject to the condition that the vehicle shall be operated as Ordinary Service .

ITEM NO-109

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. The applicant failed to produce the NOC from the finance Company . Transfer of permit is **adjourned for want of** production of NOC.

ITEM NO-110

Heard. The learned counsels appeared on behalf of the applicants. Transfer of permit is **permitted** subject to the condition that the vehicle shall be operated as Ordinary Service .

ITEM NO-111

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. The applicant failed to produce the NOC from the finance Company . Transfer of permit is **adjourned for want of** production of NOC.

ITEM NO-112

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. The applicant failed to produce the NOC from the finance Company . Transfer of permit is **adjourned for want of** production of NOC.

ITEM NO-113

Heard. The learned counsels appeared on behalf of the applicants. Transfer of permit is **permitted** subject to the condition that the vehicle shall be operated as Ordinary Service .

ITEM NO-114

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for variation of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 44 E 99 permitted to conduct service on the route Erattupetta – Vannappuram Via Kaliyar, Vandamattam, Njarukutty, Thodupuzha, Muttam, Melukavu and Edamaruku As Erattupetta – Odiyapara by extending the the route from Vannappuram to Odiyapara as ordinary service. The field officer reported that this extension is beneficial to the traveling public . Hence variation of regular permit by extension is **granted, without change in existing time schedule** except to the extent of allowing extension of the route, subject to the settlement of timings.

ITEM NO-115

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant . This is an application for variation of permit in respect of stage carriage KL 35 E 4137 on the route Kunjithanny-Nedumkandam by curtailing the route from Nedumkandam to Thookkupalam and deviating 1st trip from Rajakkadu to Kunjithanny (via) Mullakkanam, Josegiri and Bisonvalley as Ordinary Service. As per the report of the field officer the 9.1 Km from Mullakkanam to Bisonvalley via Josegiri is virgin portion and also beneficial to the travelling

public. Hence variation of regular permit by deviation of the trip to Kunjithanny via Mullakkanam, Josegiri and Bisonvalley is granted ,without altering the time schedule except to the extent of allowing the deviation subject to the settlement of timings.

ITEM NO-116

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant . This is an application for variation of permit in respect of stage carriage KL 06 H 3325 on the route Chemmannar - Thodupuzha by deviating the route from Nedumkandam to Balagram (Via) Tannimoodu instead of Kallar as Limited Stop Ordinary Service. Many objections were received in the meeting of RTA about the proposed deviation of route and the field officer did not recommend the variation of permit since this will shorten the time gap between other vehicles and this variation is not beneficial for the public. None of the circumstances enumerated in KMVR 145(6) has arisen in this case warranting any variation of route . Hence variation of regular permit application is **rejected**.

ITEM NO-117

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant . This is an application for variation of permit in respect of stage carriage KL 33 H 677 on the route Chembakappara - Thodupuzha by curtailing the route from Chembakappara to Thookkupalam . Many complaints were received in the meeting of RTA about the proposed curtailment . The field officer has not recommended the variation of permit since Ezhukumvayal to Chempakappara is a remote area and in this area mode of transportation is scarcely available and route curtailment in this portion will adversely affect the public. There is no stage carriage at 5.00 am starting from Thookkupalam to Nedumkandam. None of the circumstances enumerated in KMVR 145(6) has arisen in this case warranting any variation of route . Hence variation of regular permit application is **rejected**.

ITEM NO-118

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for variation of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 37 C 4584 permitted to conduct service on the route Kumily- Nedumkandam touching Kattappana (Via) Pathumury, Anakkara, Puttady,

Chettukuzhy, Koottar, Cumbanmettu, Puliyanmala, Pambadumpara As Kumily-Nedumkandam touching Kattappana by deviating the 2nd trip from Kattappana to Nedumkandam (Via) Balagram and Thookupalam instead of Pampadumpara as Ordinary Service. This will create a negative impact on the existing traveling facility to the traveling public. None of the circumstances enumerated in KMVR 145(6) has arisen in this case warranting any variation of route . Hence variation of regular permit **is rejected** .

ITEM NO-119

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for variation of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 05 AJ 4231 permitted to conduct service on the route Murickassery-Kattappana (Via) Thopramkudy, Thankamany and Erattayar by extending the route from Murikassery to Karimban (Via) Uppothodu as Ordinary service . The field officer has reported that the proposed variation is beneficial to the traveling public and students. Hence variation of regular permit **granted**, without altering the time schedule except to the extent of allowing the deviation and subject to the settlement of timings.

ITEM NO-120

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for variation of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 35 H 301 permitted to conduct service on the route Eettithope - Pala Via Kattappana , Cheruthoni , Moolamattam and Thodupuzha As Mullarikudy – Pala by extending the route portion from Eettithope to Mullarikudy via Melechinnar as Limited Stop Ordinary service . The field officer reported that the proposed variation is beneficial to the traveling public and students. Hence variation of regular permit **granted**, without altering the time schedule except to the extent of allowing the deviation and subject to the settlement of timings.

ITEM NO-121

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for variation of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 68 A 2575 permitted to conduct service on the route Adimaly – Vattappara via Vellathooval , Ponmudy, Rajakkad , Pooppara , Santhanpara and Senapathy As Adimaly - Udumbanchola by extending the route from

Vattappara to Udumbanchola (Via) Melechemmannar and deviating 11.00AM trip from Rajakkadu to Adimaly (via) Kalathrakuzhy instead of Ponmudy as Ordinary service. The field officer reported that the variation is beneficial to the public and the extension of route improves the mobility of rural people of Pooppara and Vattappara to nearest town Udumbanchola .The proposed deviation of trip will adversely affect the traveling public in the curtailed area . Hence variation of regular permit by extension of trip from Vattappara to Udumbanchola is **granted**, without altering the time schedule except to the extent of allowing the extension and deviation of 11.00 am trip from Rajakkadu to Adimali ,via Kallathrakuzhy **is rejected** .

ITEM NO-122

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for variation of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 06 E 3701 permitted to conduct service on the route Karimpan – Kattappana Touching Nedumknadam and Cheruthoni via Murickassery , Thopramkudy, Thankamony and Erattayar As Karimban – Kattappana touching Nedumknadam and Cheruthoni with a deviation of the route from Pathinaramkandam to Chalikada via Rajamudy and Upputhode as Ordinary Service . The field officer reported that the proposed variation is beneficial to the traveling public and students. Hence variation of regular permit **granted**, without altering the time schedule except to the extent of allowing the deviation, subject to the settlement of timings.

ITEM NO-123

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for variation of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 33 K 9745 permitted to conduct service on the route Elappara - Kumily touching Mlamala via Chappathu, Santhipalam, Chenkara, Vellaramkunnu, Chelimada, 1stMile, Pathumuri and Anavilasam by extending the first trip from Mlamala to Elappara (via) Heliburiya as Ordinary Service . The field officer reported that the proposed variation is beneficial to the traveling public and students. Hence variation of regular permit **granted** without altering the time schedule except to the extent of allowing the deviation, subject to the settlement of timings .

ITEM NO-124

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for variation of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 44 F 9599 permitted to conduct service on the route West Kodikkalam-Vannappuram (Via) Thodupuzha, Vandamattam, Mullankuthy and Thennathoor As Vannappuram – Thodupuzha (Via) Njarakkadu, West Kodikkulam, Vandamattam, Kodikkulam, Kaliyar and Mullankuthy by deviating the route from Vannappuram to Thennathoor (via) Njarakkadu in 1st and 2nd trips . RTA Muvattupuzha held on 23/12/2033 granted concurrence for variation of permit. Many objections were received in the meeting of RTA about the curtailment of trip via West Kodikkulam and Thennathoor and it is an ill served sector. The variation application involves complete shuffling of existing time schedule .It appears that the application is made for seeking revision of timings without any reason whatsoever .None of the circumstances enumerated in KMVR 145(6) has arisen in this case warranting any variation of route . Hence variation of regular permit is **rejected**.

ITEM NO-125

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant . This is an application for variation of permit in respect of stage carriage KL 33 H 8824 permitted to conduct service on the route Kattappana - Adimali (Via) Cheruthoni, Chelachuvadu and Kallarkutty by changing the halting place from Kattappana to Cheruthoni . The field officer reported that the proposed variation will adversely affect the traveling public and the termini will be changed. Field officer also reported that this variation will cause an additional trip in the morning from Cheruthoni to Kattappana in the notified route Aluva-Kattappana and Kottayam –Kattappana and a curtailment of last trip from Cheruthoni to Kattappana, which is violation of clause 19 of G O(P) No 13/2023/Trans dated 03/05/2023 . Hence variation of regular permit application is **rejected**.

ITEM NO-126

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for variation of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 35 C 9321 permitted to conduct service on the route Panickankudy-Kothamangalam (Via) Kambilikandam, Kallarkutty, Adimaly and Neriyaamangalam As Kattappana - Kothamangalam by extending the route

from Panickankudy to Kattappana as Limited Stop Ordinary service . The field officer reported that the proposed variation is beneficial to the traveling public and students. Hence variation of regular permit **granted**, without altering the time schedule except to the extent of allowing the extension subject to the settlement of timings and without change in departure time at Panickankudy.

ITEM NO-127

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant

1. This is an application for variation of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 46 F 7615 permitted to conduct service on the route Muttukadu - South Kathippara Touching Munnar (Via) Bisonvalley, Anachal, Adimaly, 1000 Acre and 2nd Mile As Muttukadu - South Kathippara Touching Munnar and Devikulam by extending the route from Munnar to Devikulam as ordinary service . The Field officer reported that the proposed extension is beneficial to the public and government employees to access the Taluk head quarters and will improve the public transportation in that area. Hence variation of regular permit as Muttukadu - South Kathippara Touching Munnar and Devikulam by extending the route from Munnar to Devikulam and without curtailment in other trips as ordinary service is granted, without altering the time schedule except to the extent of allowing the variation, subject to the settlement of timings.

2. Transfer of permit is granted subject to the clearance of all Government dues if any.

ITEM NO-128

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant . This is an application for variation of permit in respect of stage carriage KL 35 H 7344 permitted to conduct service on the route Kothamangalam - Mankadavu (Via) Oonnukal, Neriyaamangalam and Adimaly As Mankadavu - Kothamangalam by curtailing 2 trips from Adimaly to Kothamangalam and also changing the starting and halting place as Mankadavu as Limited Stop Ordinary Service . The proposed variation includes the curtailment of 2 trips from Adimaly to Kothamangalam and changing the starting and halting place as Mankadavu. The change of halting place from Kothamangalam to Mankadavu will interchange the route as Mankadavu - Kothamangalam .The variation application involves curtailment of trips ,change in halting place and complete

shuffling of existing time schedule .It appears that the application is made for seeking revision of timings without any reason whatsoever.None of the circumstances enumerated in KMVR 145(6) has arisen in this case warranting any variation of route.Hence application for variation of regular permit is **rejected**.

ITEM NO-129

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for variation of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 06 F 9005 permitted to conduct service on the route Kumily - Udumbanchola touching Vazhaveedu and Balanpillacity (via) 1st mile, Anakkara, Chellarcovil, Puliyanmala and Anavilasam As trip variation by curtailing the fourth trip from Kattappana to Balanpillacity and extending that trip from Kattappana to Nedumkandam and return trip from Nedumkandam to Kattappana Via Balanpillacity.None of the circumstances enumerated in KMVR 145(6) has arisen in this case warranting any variation of route. Many objections were raised in the meeting about the curtailment of the trip from Kattappana to Balanpilla city and Balanpilla city to Nedumkandam. Hence variation of regular permit is **rejected**

ITEM NO-130

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant . This is an application for variation of permit in respect of stage carriage KL 07 CH 5450 permitted to conduct service on the route Vannappuram - Kattappana Touching Adimaly (Via) Chelachuvadu, Cheruthony and Kallarkutty as Thodupuzha –Kattappana Touchiny Adimaly by extending the route from Vannappuram to Thodupuzha (Via) Kaliyar, Vandamattam by pass, Njarukutty and Muthalakodam as Ordinary Service. The field officer reported that, after variation, the total overlapping distance is 28.5 Km which is 26 % of the route length and is objectionable. The proposed variation includes an additional overlapping of 1.2 Kms from Thodupuzha Municipal Bus stand to More Jn in the Aluva - Kattappana scheme. Hence variation of regular permit application is **rejected**

ITEM NO-131

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for variation of regular permit in respect of stage carriage

KL 06 G 7127 permitted to conduct service on the route Maniyarankudy-Kumily Touching Vallakkadavu (Via) Thadiyampadu, Cheruthony, Kattappana and Puliyanmala AS Maniyarankudy - Kumily (Via) Thadiyampadu, Cheruthony, Kattappana and Puliyanmala by curtailing the route portion from Kattappana to Vallakkadavu as Ordinary Service. The proposed variation involves curtailment of existing trips to vallakkadavu . Many objections were raised against the proposed curtailment of trips. None of the circumstances enumerated in KMVR 145(6) has arisen in this case warranting any variation of route by curtailment from Kattappana to Vallakkadavu. Hence application for variation of regular permit is **rejected**

ITEM NO-132

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh four months temporary permit in respect of stage carriage KL 40 1233 on the route Vazhakulam - Parapuzha Temple via Kavana, Arikuzha , Manakkadu, Thodupuzha , Muthalakodam, Pazhukkakulam, West Kodikulam and Parapuzha as ordinary service . It is an inter district route with total route length having 28.2 Kms , out of which 24.4 Kms lies in the jurisdiction of RTA Idukki and 3.8 Kms lies in the jurisdiction of RTA Muvattupuzha . 1.2 km from Thodupuzha Municipal bus stand to New KSRTC Bus Stand overlaps with Kottayam- Kattappana scheme and 100 meters from Vazhakulam Bus stand to Arikuzha Kavala overlaps with Aluva –Kattappana Scheme .The Field officer has not reported any urgent temporary need, specified in Sec 87 Motor Vehicles Act ,1988 as amended in 2019.Hence four months temporary permit application is **rejected**.

ITEM NO-133

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for a fresh four months temporary permit in respect of stage carriage KL 07 BL 1747 on the route Elappara - Dharmavally Via Chappathu, Mlamala and Vandiperiyar as ordinary service. It is an intra district route with a total route length having 41.7 Kms . 5.7 kms from Kurusimudu to Dharmavalley is the virgin portion. 1.24 kms from Vandiperiyar bus stand To Kakki Jn overlaps with Kottayam - Thekkady scheme. The students of Dharmavalley have to walk 4 Kms through tea and cardamom plantation to reach school. Since the tea plantation is adjacent to the Periyar Tiger Reserve

forest, the residents are in threat of spotting and attack of wild animals like leopard and bear. Because of this wild animal threat and lack of transportation facilities, the parents are hesitating to send their kids to school. Hon'ble Member of Parliament Sri Dean Kuriakose, M P and Hon'ble Member of Legislative Assembly ,Sri Vazhoor Soman, MLA have sent recommendation for grant of this permit .The field officer conducted detailed enquiry and submitted a report. Considering the urgent need of special kind mentioned above , a four month temporary permit is **granted** to stage carriage KL 07 BL 1747 on the route Elappara - Dharmavally as ordinary service with the proposed time and production of road fitness certificate from the concerned authorities. It also directed the grantee to apply for Fresh Regular Permit in this route immediately on grant of this permit .

ITEM NO-134

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh four months temporary permit in respect of stage carriage KL 37 F 2108 on the route Vandiperiyar - Munnar Via Mlamala, Chenkara, Chelimada, Kumily, Nedumkandam , Pooppara and Nedumkandam as ordinary service. It is an intra district route with total route length having 138.8 Kms. 0.1 km from Vandiperiyar bus stand to Turning to Mlamala and 2.2 Kms from Chelimada Jn to Kumily Bus stand Overlaps with Kottayam-Thekkady Scheme. The Field officer,who conducted enquiry has not reported any urgent temporary need, specified in Sec 87 Motor Vehicles Act ,1988 as amended in 2019. Hence fresh four months temporary permit application is **rejected**.

ITEM NO-135

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for four months extension temporary permit in respect of stage carriage KL 07 AS 5333 operating on the route Vandiperiyar –Thengakkal by extending the route from Vandiperiyar to Pachakkanam . The existing route length from Vandiperiyar to Thengakkal is 15 Kms and the route length of the extension portion is 20 Kms. The route portion from Vandiperiyar to Kakkikavala having a route length 1.3 Km overlaps in the Trivandrum-Thekkady scheme . The deputy director (Project tiger) Thekkady intimated that Pachakkanam is a place located within the Periyar Tiger Reserve and the road leading to this area is a part of the Tiger Reserve and hence the status of the

road is Tiger Reserve. The Periyar Tiger Reserve is managed as per the prescription of the Tiger Conservation Plan (TCP) which is prepared as per the provisions of Sec. 38V of the Wildlife Protection Act, 1972 and approved by the National Tiger Conservation Authority under section 380 (1) (a) of the said Act. The provisions for vehicular traffic regulations in Periyar Tiger Reserve are defined under Para 3.3 'Vehicular Traffic Regulation' of the TCP. Hence **Rejected**.

ITEM NO-136

Heard. The applicant was absent. This is an application for replacement of stage carriage KL 02 BS 9367 with another vehicle KL 02 BU 5733 on the route Kundara-Kumily (Via) Adoor, Pathanamthitta, Erumely, Kanjirappally, Mundakkayam and Kuttikkanam as Limited Stop Ordinary Service. Regular permit expired on 13/11/2015 and renewal of regular permit is pending since the total route length exceeds 140 Km. Hence adjourned.

ITEM NO-137

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. Sri Jose Mathew, holding a stage carriage permit on the route Kottayam - Nedumkandam and stage carriage KL 34 F 6099 held under lease agreement, has been operating on the route, the said vehicle was issued a clearance certificate and the said route has fallen vacant. The application for renewal of permit was pending consideration, for the reason of route length being above 140 kms. The permit holder has not performed his duty in as much as he did not maintain a suitable vehicle for conducting service during the subsistence of the permit. He did not respond to the show cause notice issued to him, why the permit should not be cancelled. Under these circumstances, in exercise of the powers under section 86(1) of the MV act, **the permit is cancelled**. In view of this order of cancellation of the permit, the request for renewal of the permit as well as replacement of the vehicle is **rejected**.

ITEM NO-138

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. Replacement of the route bus KL 33 E 7290 by an incoming vehicle bearing registration number KL 33 M 3110 can be considered only on receipt of the clearance certificate in respect of the later vehicle. Hence **rejected**.

ITEM NO-139

Heard. This is the request of Secretary RTA Muvattupuzha for concurrence for grant of fresh regular permit on the route Vazhithala - Pothanikkadu via Periyambra, Puthuppariyaram, Chittur, Manakkadu, Kothayikunnu bus stand, Thodupuzha, Arikkuzha, Parakkadavu, Pandappally, Arakkuzha, Muvattupuzha, Randar, Ayavana and Manappuzha as Ordinary Service. The enquiry officer reported that as per the present traffic regulations, stage carriage operating in this direction are traveling through Thodupuzha town, Gandhi square, KSRTC Bus Station and Thodupuzha Municipal Bus Stand. The line of traverse proposed by the applicant is in such a way that the stage carriage is directly enters into the back side of the bus stand through Ashirwad theater road, avoiding the overlapping with notified route for a distance of 1.2 kms with Kottayam –Kattappana notified route. Hence **granted**.

ITEM NO-140

Heard. This is the request of Secretary RTA Muvattupuzha for concurrence for grant of fresh regular permit on the route Adimaly-Aluva via Neriamangalam, Kothamangalam, Odakkaly, Kuruppampady, Perumbavoor, South Vazhakulam and Choondy as Limited Stop Ordinary Service. The enquiry officer reported that 27.5 Kms from Adimaly to Neriya mangalam is lying under the Jurisdiction of RTA Idukki and there is no overlapping with the notified routes. Hence concurrence for fresh permit is **granted** without prejudice to the right of the primary authority to decide the nature of service depending on the conditions in GO(P) No 13/2023/trans dated 03/05/2023.

ITEM NO-141

Repetition of ITEM 140

ITEM NO-142

1. Sri. Subaik, Vettarkunnel, Selliampara, Vellathooval has applied for fresh regular permit on the route Senapathy –Adimaly via Santhanpara, Pooppara, Rajakkadu, Kunjithanny, Adit, Anachal, Thokkupara, Kallarkutty, Vellathooval and Kaltharakuzhy as Ordinary Service. RTA held on 04/06/2022 vide item No.5 has considered the application and fresh regular permit was granted on the route Senapathy –Adimaly subject to settlement of timings. The grantee is issued with direction on 30.07.2022, to produce the registration certificate and

other records of the vehicle within 30 days from the date of communication of the decision as per rule 159 (2) of KMV Rules 1989, failing which the grant of the regular permit will be treated as revoked without further notice . But the grantee has failed to produce them . Hence the fresh **regular permit granted by RTA Idukki held on 04/06/2022 vide item no 5 is revoked.**

2. Sri. Tony Mathew, Puthiyaparmbil House, Ezhukumvayal has applied for fresh regular permit on the route Anachal-Nedumkandam (via) Kunchithanni, Muttukadu, Rajakumary, Chemmannar, Udumbanchola, Baisonvaly as ordinary

Service. RTA held on 11/01/2023 vide item No 10 has considered the application and fresh regular permit was granted on the route Anachal-Nedumkandam subject to settlement of timings. The grantee is issued with direction, on 07.03.2023 to produce the registration certificate and other records of the vehicle within 30 days from the date of communication of the decision as per rule 159 (2) of KMV Rules 1989, failing which the grant of the regular permit will be treated as revoked without further notice . The grantee has failed to produce records of the vehicle. Hence the **fresh regular permit granted by RTA Idukki held on 11/01/2023 vide item no 10 is revoked.**

3. Sri. Arjun Sunilkumar, Chemmannoor House, Manakkad, P. O, Thodupuzha has applied for fresh regular permit on the route Chelachuvadu- Vannappuram (via) Kanjikuzhi, Pazhayarikkandom and Venmoney as ordinary service. RTA held on 11/01/2023 vide item No 19 has considered the application and fresh regular permit was granted on the route Chelachuvadu- Vannappuram subject to settlement of timings. The grantee is issued with direction , on 07.03.2023 ,to produce the current records of the vehicle within 30 days from the date of communication of the decision as per rule 159 (2) of KMV Rules 1989, failing which the grant of the regular permit will be treated as revoked without further notice . The grantee failed to produce the Certificate of Registration and other relevant documents in time .The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant has produced a copy of Judgement in WP© No 28568/2024 dated 12/08/2024 of Hon'ble High Court of Kerala, with a direction to the respondent authority to take a final decision within two months from today regarding the timing for the petitioner's stage carriage operation on the, granted route Chelachuvadu -Vannappuram. Since the Grantee failed to produce the Certificate of Registration and other records , within the period

stipulated in the Rule 159 (2) KMVRules, the **fresh regular permit granted by RTA Idukki held on 11/01/2023 vide item no 19** is revoked.

ITEM NO-143

The action taken by the Secretary RTA Idukki in issuing a special permit to stage carriage KL 68 A 3200 to Mundakai, the Landslip area in Wayanadu with essential commodities and volunteers is ratified.

ITEM NO-144

This matter is considered by the Board during the Meeting .Sri Pratheesh R ,Prethi bhavan,Santhi nagar ,Kunthalam para ,Kattappana has forwarded this complaint alleging that fare stage and distance between Mundakayam to Kattappana is not proportional and also demanded to fix fare stages according to actual distance in the route segment .

Detailed enquiry was conducted through the Joint Regional Transport Officer,Vandiperiyar .This authority perused the report and other material factors connected to this issue .The fare stages were fixed, as per KMV Rule 211, long before,when the bus services were started in this route considering different criteria and economic viability of the service. Several factors are to be considered together while fixing fare stages of a stage carriage service.The distance is only one of the criteria considered along with other factors . The RTA fixed farestage , under Rule 211,considering all those factors and it could not be reviewed citing change in one of the components .

Hence the fare stage fixation in the said segment needs no revision.

ITEM NO-145

Power delegated to the Secretary RTA Idukki for the issue of Licensing of agents engaged in the Business of collecting, forwarding and distributing goods carried by goods carriages under Rule 194 of Kerala Motor Vehicle Rules.

ITEM NO-146

This is an item to consider the request received in Nava Kerala Sadas to grant fresh regular permit to private stage carriages in a gap of minimum 15 to 30 minutes.This authority discussed the matter in detail. There are no provisions in Motor Vehicle Act 1988 to prevent the grant of fresh regular permits in a

particular time interval. The time settlement of stage carriages are done in accordance with the D3 Directions issued by the STA. Secretary RTA is directed to issue maximum time gaps as possible at the time of conducting time conferences.

ITEM NO-147

This is an item to consider the request received in Nava Kerala Sadas against the grant of new private stage carriage permits in Idukki District .This authority discussed the matter in detail. There are no provisions in Motor Vehicle Act 1988 to restrict the grant of fresh regular permits.

ITEM NO-148

This is an item to consider the request received in Nava Kerala Sadas for deviating the buses from Asoka Junction by avoiding Moolamattam town on the route Cheruthoni – Thodupuzha. The passengers from Moolamattam and the KSRTC officials strongly objected to this request. If the variation granted, these buses will deviate from Asokan Kavala, instead of going through Moolmattom. This will affect the commuters residing in that area .Hence the application is rejected.

ITEM NO-149

Ratified the action taken by Secretary RTA Idukki.

ITEM NO-150

Supplementary Items.

ITEM NO-151

Date for next RTA meeting will be intimate later

SUPPLEMENTARY ITEM NO-1

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant . This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of a new or suitable stage carriage with seating capacity 38 in all to operate on the route Kattappana – Cheruthoni Via Nathukallu ,Kochuthovala, Erattayar, Santhigram, Nalumukku,

Thankamani, Pandipara, Mariyapuram and Idukki with Halt at Idinjamala as Ordinary Service. It is an intra district route with total route length having 41.9 Kms . As per the report of the field officer 2.4 Kms from Idukki Kavala to Cheruthoni overlaps with Aluva – Kattappana and Kottayam – Kattappana Scheme. Overlapping with notified routes exceeds 5% of total route length. Hence **Rejected**.

SUPPLEMENTARY ITEM NO-2

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of new or suitable stage carriage with seating capacity 48 in all to operate on the route Thennathoor – Cheenikkuzhy Via West Kodikkulam, Kunnam, Muthalakkodam, Thodupuzha, Karimannoor, Udumbannoor, Chakkappankavala, Kottakkavala, Pariyaram, Kizhakkumpadam as Ordinary Service. It is an intra district route with total route length having 36.8 Kms. 1.2 Kms from Thodupuzha Municipal Bus stand out to More Junction overlaps with Kottayam – Kattappana via Moolamattam Scheme. Overlapping with the notified route is does not exceeds 5% of total route length. The applicant at the time of hearing today has offered the vehicle KL 38 4131 in his name. Hence fresh regular permit is **granted** to stage carriage KL 38 4131 on the route Thennathoor – Cheenikkuzhy Via West Kodikkulam, Kunnam, Muthalakkodam, Thodupuzha, Karimannoor, Udumbannoor, Chakkappankavala, Kottakkavala, Pariyaram, Kizhakkumpadam as Ordinary Service subject to settlement of timings. The grantee is directed to produce the current records of the vehicle within 30 days from the date of communication of the decision as per rule 159 (2) of KMV Rules 1989, failing which the grant of the regular permit will be treated as revoked without further notice.

SUPPLEMENTARY ITEM NO-3

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for fresh regular permit in respect of new or suitable stage carriage with seating capacity 48 in all to operate on the Rajakkadu - Vandiperiyar Via Nedumkandam, Melechinnar, Thookkupalam, Kattappana and Chappathu with Halt at Mlamala as ordinary service. It is an intra district route

with a total route length having 129.7 Kms. The proposed route overlaps 0.1 Kms at Vandiperiyar town with Kottayam – Thekkady scheme and 0.6 Kms from Idukki kavala to Kattappana old bus stand with Kottayam - Kattappana and Aluva – Kattappana scheme. Total overlapping is Only 0.7km. Overlapping with notified route does not exceed 5% of total route length. The applicant at the time of hearing today has offered the vehicle KL 05 AK 1238 in her name. Hence fresh regular permit is **granted** to stage carriage KL 05 AK 1238 on the route Rajakkadu - Vandiperiyar as Ordinary Service subject to settlement of timings. The grantee is directed to produce the current records of the vehicle within 30 days from the date of communication of the decision as per rule 159 (2) of KMV Rules 1989, failing which the grant of the regular permit will be treated up as revoked without further notice.

SUPPLEMENTARY ITEM NO-4

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. Transfer of permit is **permitted** subject to the condition that the vehicle shall be operated as Ordinary Service.

SUPPLEMENTARY ITEM NO-5

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. Transfer of permit adjourned for want of production of NOC from the financier

SUPPLEMENTARY ITEM NO-6

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for variation of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL 59 900 permitted to conduct service on the route Murickassery - Nagampadam bus stand via Poomamkandam, Chelachuvadu, Venmony, Vannappuram, Kaliyar, Vandamattam, Thodupuzha, Manakkadu Jn, Vazhithala, Santhigiri College, Kuninji, Ramapuram, Uzhavoor, Marangattupally, Kidangoor, Ayarkunnam, Manarkadu Jn, Nalumanikattu, Kalathipady and Collectorate Kottayam As Udayagiri - Nagambadam bus stand by extending the route from Murickassery to Udayagiri via Thopramkudy as Ordinary Service. The variation applied is beneficial to the traveling public and school

children. Hence variation of regular permit by extension is **granted**, without altering the existing time schedule except to the extent of allowing the extension, subject to the settlement of timings.

SUPPLEMENTARY ITEM NO-7

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for variation of regular permit in respect of Stage Carriage KL 38 F 3213 permitted to conduct service on the route Thattakkuzha - Erattupetta via Muttam and Melukavu As Kalayanthani-Erattupetta by curtailing the trip to Thattakkuzha as Ordinary Service. Many objections were raised in the meeting about the curtailment of the trip to Thattakkuzha . Hence variation of regular permit is **rejected**

SUPPLEMENTARY ITEM NO-8

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for variation of regular permit in respect of Stage Carriage KL 08 BA 0342 operating on the route Devikulam - Adimaly Touching Muttukadu (via) Munnar, Anachal, Thokkupara, Kunjithanny, Pottankadu and Bisonvalley AS Rajakumary - Adimaly Touching Munnar (Via) Khajanappara, Muttukadu, Bisonvalley, Pottankadu, Kunjithanny, Thokkupara as Ordinary Service . Many objections were raised in the meeting about the curtailment of trip from Devikulam to Munnar and from Munnar to Muttukadu . Hence variation of regular permit is **rejected**

SUPPLEMENTARY ITEM NO-9

Heard. The learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant. This is an application for variation of regular permit in respect of Stage Carriage KL 38 C 6069 permitted to conduct service on the route Thopramkudy - Thodupuzha (Via) Murikkassery, Poomankandam, Chelachuvadu, Kanjikuzhy, Venmony, Vannappuram, Kodikulam, Vandamattam , Karimpan, Cheruthony and Idukki Medical college As Thopramkudy - Thodupuzha by extending the second trip from Cheruthoni to Erattayar (Via) Idukki and Thankamani as LSOS. The proposed variation includes an additional overlapping of 2.4 Km from Idukki Kavala to Cheruthony in the Aluva - Kattappana scheme. Hence variation of regular permit is **rejected**

SUPPLEMENTARY ITEM NO-10

This is an item to consider the application for the approval of the Bus stand at Cheruthoni. This authority discussed the matter in detail. Many objections were raised in the meeting that adequate facilities are not available in the bus stand. Secretary RTA is directed to enquire about the matter and place it in the next meeting of RTA. Hence adjourned.

1. Smt.V. Vighneswary.IAS**District Collector &****S/d****Chairperson, RTA, Idukki****2. Sri. Anoop Varkey,****Deputy Transport Commissioner CZ –II,****S/d****Ernakulam & Member ,RTA, Idukki**