

Item No 1

Heard.

1. The route overlaps on the notified route Kottayam – Kozhikkode and Kozhikkode – Guruvayoor on a distance of 5.1 kms which exceeds the maximum permissible limit prescribed in clause 5(c) of notification No. 42/2009/TRAN dated 14/07/2009. Hence violates the said notification.
2. The applicant did not comply the directions given to produce a modified time schedule prepared @ 2.5 minutes/kilometer so as to confirm with the order of STA No. D3/875/STA/2005 dated 08/11/2011.

For the above reasons the application for regular permit rejected.

Item No 1(a)

Heard. The regular permit granted in respect of S/C KL 10 L 5490 subject to the fixation of running time as per order no. D3/875/STA/2005 dt.08/11/2011 of STA and settlement of timings and verification of genuineness of vehicle offered.

Applicant shall produce revised time schedule if necessary in compliance with the running time so fixed.

Item No 2

Heard. The regular permit granted in respect of S/C KL 10 L 6344 subject to the fixation of running time as per order no. D3/875/STA/2005 dt.08/11/2011 of STA and settlement of timings and verification of genuineness of vehicle offered.

Applicant shall produce revised time schedule if necessary in compliance with the running time so fixed.

Item No 3

Heard. The regular permit granted in respect of S/C KL 09 K 5647 subject to the fixation of running time as per order no. D3/875/STA/2005 dt.08/11/2011 of STA and settlement of timings and verification of genuineness of vehicle offered.

Applicant shall produce revised time schedule if necessary in compliance with the running time so fixed.

Item No 4

Heard.

1. Applicant not offered any vehicle.
2. The applicant has not furnished the mandatory details as per the application form prescribed under rule 143(a) of KMVR 1989 such as seating capacity, maximum laden weight, wheel base, number of wheels etc. As per G.O.(P) No 67/2011/Tran dated 30/11/2011 the Government decided not to issue stage carriage permit to vehicles having only 4 wheels. The applicant also failed to furnish the above details at the time of consideration of this application for which the applicant is liable as per section 70(1)(b) of M V Act.

The decision on the application is adjourned for the compliance of above matters.

Item No 5

Heard.

1. Applicant not offered any vehicle.
2. The applicant has not furnished the mandatory details as per the application form prescribed under rule 143(a) of KMVR 1989 such as seating capacity, maximum laden weight, wheel base, number of wheels etc. As per G.O.(P) No 67/2011/Tran dated 30/11/2011 the Government decided not to issue stage carriage permit to vehicles having only 4 wheels.

The applicant also failed to furnish the above details at the time of consideration of this application for which the applicant is liable as per section 70(1)(b) of M V Act.

3. Secretary is directed to fix running time according to the order no. D3/875/STA/2005 dt.08/11/2011 of STA and direct the applicant to furnish time schedule as per the running time so fixed.

The application is adjourned for the compliance of the above matters.

Item No 6

Heard. The regular permit granted in respect of S/C KL 55 A 465 subject to settlement of timings.

Item No 7

Heard.

1. The route overlaps on the notified route Palakkad - Kannur on a distance of 1.5 kms which exceeds the maximum permissible limit prescribed in clause 5(c) of notification No. 42/2009/TRAN dated 14/07/2009. Hence violates the said notification.
2. Applicant not offered any vehicle.
3. The applicant has not furnished the mandatory details as per the application form prescribed under rule 143(a) of KMVR 1989 such as seating capacity, maximum laden weight, wheel base, number of wheels etc. As per G.O.(P) No 67/2011/Tran dated 30/11/2011 the Government decided not to issue stage carriage permit to vehicles having only 4 wheels.
The applicant also failed to furnish the above details at the time of consideration of this application for which the applicant is liable as per section 70(1)(b) of M V Act.

For the above reasons the application for regular permit rejected.

Item No 8

Heard. The regular permit granted in respect of S/C KL 10 Q 8574 subject to settlement of timings.

Item No 9

Heard. The applicant offered six wheeled S/C KL-10-R-1456 and regular permit granted subject to the settlement of timings.

Item No 10

Heard. This is an inter district route and a portion of the route is lying in Kozhikkode district on a distance of 29 kms. Hence Secretary is directed (1) to seek concurrence from Regional Transport Authority, Kozhikkode with specific remark regarding the distance of overlapping if any on the portion lying in the jurisdiction of Sister Regional Transport Authority. (2) to enquire and report the necessity and feasibility of granting permit as fast passenger service on the route applied. Adjourned for the compliance of the above matters.

Item No 11

Heard. The regular permit granted in respect of S/C KL 10 J 3069 subject to settlement of timings. The existing fare stage at Kollamchina is decided to shift to Pottammalmadu and Secretary, Regional Transport Authority is directed to issue a list of fare stages to that effect.

Item No 12

Heard. The applicant offered six wheeled S/C KL-10-N-4449 and regular permit granted subject to the settlement of timings and verification of genuineness of vehicle offered.

Item No 13

Heard. The regular permit granted in respect of S/C KL 10 AJ 6789 subject to settlement of timings with running time @ 2.5minutes/kilometer on all trips.

Item No 14

Heard. The regular permit granted in respect of S/C KL 06 B 8775 subject to settlement of timings.

Item No 15

Heard. Granted subject to production of revised time schedule in conformity with order of STA No. D3/875/STA/2005 dated 08/11/2011 and settlement of timings.

Item No 16

Heard. Granted subject to production of revised time schedule in conformity with order of STA No. D3/875/STA/2005 dated 08/11/2011 and settlement of timings.

Item No 17

Heard. This is an application for fresh Temporary Permit U/S 87(1)(c). The applicant has not furnished any time schedule. There is no report on compliance of order of STA No. D3/875/STA/2005 dated 08/11/2011. The field officer has reported that there is no situation prevailing for the issue of Temporary Permit U/S 87(1)(c) of MV Act. Hence the application for fresh Temporary Permit u/s 87(1)(c) of MV Act is rejected.

Item No 18

Heard. This is an application for fresh Temporary Permit U/S 87(1)(c). The applicant has not furnished any time schedule. There is no report on compliance of order of STA No. D3/875/STA/2005 dated 08/11/2011. The field officer has reported that there is no situation prevailing for the issue of Temporary Permit U/S 87(1)(c) of MV Act. Hence the application for fresh Temporary Permit u/s 87(1)(c) of MV Act is rejected.

Item No 19

Heard. Perused records. Variation granted subject to settlement of timings after fixing running time in accordance with order of STA No. D3/875/STA/2005 dated 08/11/2011.

Item No 20

Heard

1. This is an application for variation by extension, curtailment and increase in number of trips. As per the report of field officer the curtailment of 6 single trips between Ambalaparamba and Kanhipura will adversely affect the existing traveling public.
2. The proposed variation includes increase of number of trips through the notified route Kottayam – Kozhikkode vide notification no. 42/2009/TRAN dated 14/07/2009 and as per clause 19 of this said notification the right to increase no of trips in the notified route and its portions is reserved for KSRTC only. The grant of this variation is against the above said notification.

For the above reasons the variation application rejected.

Item No 21

Heard. Perused records. Variation granted subject to settlement of timings after fixing running time in accordance with order of STA No. D3/875/STA/2005 dated 08/11/2011.

Item No 22

Heard. Perused records. This is an application for variation by curtailment and deviation and to convert the service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger. The vehicle S/C KL-58-1112 covered by this permit has been issued with clearance certificate to RTO, Palakkad on 03/10/2011 as per the order of Hon'ble STAT in MVARP 299/2011 dated 30/09/2011 without insisting surrender of permit. Now there is no vehicle to operate this permit from 03/10/2011 onwards.

The curtailment proposed will adversely affect the traveling public depending this service during morning hours. The deviation proposed from Kunnankulam to Thrissur via Anjoor Road, Mukhanmoodi much, Thampurapadi, Mammiyoor, Guruvayur, Chowwalloorpadi, Paris Road, Kanipayur overlaps on the notified routes Kozhikkode – Guruvayur and Thrissur – Guruvayur on a total distance of 5kms. This overlapping is more than 25% of the total deviation distance and is the violation of clause 5(c) of notification no. 42/2009/TRAN dated 14/07/2009.

This authority is convinced that this variation application will not serve the convenience of public and is not complying the provision under sub section 3 of section 80 of MV Act and is rejected.

Considered the request for conversion of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger. In view of the decision on variation application mentioned above, the route length is below 140 kms and the service can be operated as an ordinary service as per rule 2(oa) and the conversion application is rejected for the following reasons.

- a) The KSRTC vehemently objected the conversion of the service as Fast Passenger Service as the major portion of the route overlaps on the notified route and the conversion of the service will adversely affect their similar services on this sector.
- b) As per the notification No. 42/2009/TRAN dated 14.07.2009 the right to operate any new service on the notified route or its portions is reserved exclusively to State Transport Undertaking only. If the conversion of service as Fast Passenger Service is granted it will result as introduction of a new service and will violate the above said notification.
- c) Stops will be reduced, students depending this service on various portions of its route will be deprived of their concessional rate Traveling facility.
- d) The daily commuters on various portions of this service will have to pay higher rate of fare without availing any additional facilities.
- e) The variation proposed is not in compliance with the provisions of Section 80(3) of MV Act regarding the convenience of the travelling public.

The Secretary is directed to issue notice under rule 152 of KMVR since the permit holder has failed to operate the service for more than 6 months.

Item No 23

Heard.

1. Perused the judgment of Hon'ble High Court reported in 2000(3) KLT 610.
2. Considered the application for conversion of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger. This permit is renewed up to 15/02/2015 by this authority. Conversion of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger service will adversely affect the traveling public and students depending this service. Hence rejected for the following reasons.
 - a) The KSRTC vehemently objected the conversion of the service as Fast Passenger Service as the major portion of the route overlaps on the notified route and the conversion of the service will adversely affect their similar services on this sector.
 - b) As per the notification No. 42/2009/TRAN dated 14.07.2009 the right to operate any new service is reserved exclusively to State Transport Undertaking only. If the conversion of service as Fast Passenger Service is granted it will result as introduction of a new service and will violate the above said notification.
 - c) Stops will be reduced, students depending this service on various portions of its route will be deprived of their concessional rate Traveling facility.
 - d) The daily commuters on various portions of this service will have to pay higher rate of fare without availing any additional facilities.
 - e) The variation proposed is not in compliance with the provisions of Section 80(3) of MV Act regarding the convenience of traveling public.

Item No 24

Heard.

1. Perused the order of Hon'ble STAT in MVARP No. 423/2011 dated 23/03/2012.
2. The regular permit is valid up to 03/06/2011 only. The permit renewal application is pending for want of concurrences from sister RTAs. In obedience to the order of Hon'ble STAT

conversion of service as Super Fast granted subject to the renewal of permit and compliance of rule 260(A) of KMVR 1989. Considering the safety aspect and present road infrastructure it is also decided not to reduce running time by increasing the speed at which the service is operating and there fore there is no change in rate of running time and number of stops.

Item No 25

Heard.

1. Perused the order of Hon'ble STAT in MVARP No. 128/2011 dated 14/09/2011. In obedience to the above order conversion of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger granted subject to the fixing of running time fixed as per the order no. D3/875/STA/2005 dated 08/11/2011 of STA and settlement of timings. The applicant is directed to produce revised time schedule in conformity with the running fixed by Secretary as per order no. D3/875/STA/2005 dated 08/11/2011 of STA. It is also decided to retain the existing stops considering the convenience of traveling public.
2. Perused the judgement in WP(C)31578/2010 of Hon'ble High Court and order of Hon'ble STAT in MVAA No. 125/2011 dated 03/01/2012. In obedience to the above orders considered the request for variation proposing increase of two trips between Kozhikkode and Thrissur which is overlapping on the notified routes Kottayam – Kozhikkode and Guruvayur – Kozhikkode from Thrissur to Perumbilavu and Edappal to Kozhikkode. As per clause 19 of notification no 42/2009/TRAN dated 14.07.2009 the right to increase number of trips on notified routes reserved to KSRTC only. Hence the variation application is the violation of above such notification. The KSRTC also vehemently objected the increase of number of trips on the notified route. For the above reasons the application for variation is rejected.

Item No 26

Heard. This permit is valid up to 23/08/2013 to operate as Limited Stop Fast Passenger. Considered the application for conversion of service as Super Fast Passenger and rejected for the following reasons.

- a. The KSRTC vehemently objected the conversion of the service as Super Fast Passenger Service as the major portion of the route overlaps on the notified route and the conversion of the service will adversely affect their similar services on this sector.
- b. As per the notification No. 42/2009/TRAN dated 14.07.2009 the right to operate any new service is reserved exclusively to State Transport Undertaking only. If the conversion of service as Super Fast Passenger Service is granted it will result as introduction of a new service and will violate the above said notification.
- c. Stops will be reduced and the existing daily commuters depending this service will be deprived of their existing traveling facility.
- d. The daily commuters on various portions of this service will have to pay higher rate of fare without availing any additional facilities.

Item No 27

Heard.

1. Perused the judgment of Hon'ble High Court in WP© No. 23685/2011
2. This permit is valid up to 29/01/2010. In obedience to the order of Hon'ble High Court in wp© 23685/2011 considered the application for conversion of service as Super Fast Passenger and rejected for the following reasons.
 - a. The KSRTC vehemently objected the conversion of the service as Super Fast Passenger Service as the major portion of the route overlaps on the notified route and the conversion of the service will adversely affect their similar services on this sector.
 - b. As per the notification No. 42/2009/TRAN dated 14.07.2009 the right to operate any new service is reserved exclusively to State Transport Undertaking only. If the conversion of

service as Super Fast Passenger Service is granted it will result as introduction of a new service and will violate the above said notification.

- c. Stops will be reduced, students depending this service on various portions of its route will be deprived of their concessional rate Traveling facility.
- d. The daily commuters on various portions of this service will have to pay higher rate of fare without availing any additional facilities.

Item No 28

Heard. Perused the judgment of Hon'ble High Court in WP© No. 2188/2012 dated 28/03/2012 and connected records. The Hon'ble High Court in the above judgment has directed to consider the application dated 21/11/2011 for conversion of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger. This Regional Transport Authority has already considered this application in its meeting held on 14/12/2011 and rejected vide decision in item no 61 and communicated to the applicant on 10/02/2012. Hence the direction contained in judgment dated 30/01/2012 in WP(C) 2188/2012 is already complied and the said decision is not challenged before any higher forum.

Item No 29

Secretary is allowed to seek concurrence from Sister RTA, Kozhikkode.

Item No 30

Secretary is allowed to seek concurrence from Sister RTA, Palakkad.

Item No 31

Secretary is allowed to seek concurrence from Sister RTA, Kozhikkode.

Item No 32

Secretary is allowed to seek concurrence from Sister RTA, Kozhikkode.

Item No 33

Secretary is allowed to seek concurrence from Sister RTA, Kozhikkode.

Item No 34

Secretary is allowed to seek concurrence from Sister RTA, Palakkad.

Item No 35

Secretary is allowed to seek concurrence from Sister RTA, Kozhikkode.

Item No 36

Secretary is allowed to seek concurrence from Sister RTA, Kozhikkode.

Item No 37

Secretary is allowed to seek concurrence from Sister RTA, Palakkad.

Item No 38

Secretary is allowed to seek concurrence from Sister RTA, Palakkad.

Item No 39

Secretary is allowed to seek concurrence from Sister RTA, Palakkad and Kozhikkode.

Item No 40

Secretary is allowed to seek concurrence from Sister RTA, Palakkad and Thrissur.

Item No 41

Secretary is allowed to seek concurrence from Sister RTA, Kozhikkode.

Item No 42

Secretary is allowed to seek concurrence from Sister RTA, Thrissur.

Item No 43

Secretary is allowed to seek concurrence from Sister RTA, Palakkad.

Item No 44

Secretary is allowed to seek concurrence from Sister RTA, Thrissur.

Item No 45

Secretary is allowed to seek concurrence from Sister RTA Palakkad and Kozhikkode.

Item No 46

Secretary is allowed to seek concurrence from Sister RTA, Thrissur and Kozhikkode.

Item No 47

1. This is an inter district route and requires concurrence from sister RTA's. Secretary is allowed to seek concurrence from sister RTA Kozhikkode & Palakkad.

2(a). Considered the application for replacement of vehicle on the permit covered earlier by the S/C KL-09-U-3799 with the S/C KL-09-AB-7345. The replacement application is attached with a hire agreement which is not found as legally registered and endorsed in the Registration Certificate as per Motor Vehicle Act & Rules.

(b). Neither the records of the vehicle is made available nor the particulars of the vehicle is seen furnished as per rule 174(1). Hence applicant is directed to produce the records of the vehicle proposed to replace.

(c). Applicant is required to produce the consent from the financier, if any, of the incoming vehicle. For the compliance of the above matters the application for renewal and replacement is adjourned.

Item No 48

Secretary is allowed to seek concurrence from Sister RTA, Palakkad.

Item No 49

Heard. The permit was valid up to 03/01/2012 and was issued prior to 09/05/2006. This authority is convinced that the applicant was prevented from filing application for renewal of permit in time due to good and sufficient reason. Hence the delay occurred in filing application for renewal is condoned.

As per clause 4 of notification no 42/2009/TRAN dated 14/07/2009 the regular permit will be issued after the expiry of permits issued prior to 09/05/2006. In this case the permit was issued prior to 09/05/2006. Hence renewal of regular permit granted.

Item No 50

Heard. Perused the judgment of Hon'ble High Court in WP© No. 6969/2012 dated 28/03/2012. In obedience to the above order of Hon'ble High Court considered the application for delay condonation and renewal of permit in respect of S/C KL-12-A-5659. The permit was valid up to 03/01/2012 and was issued prior to 09/05/2006. This authority is convinced that the applicant was prevented from filing application for renewal of permit in time due to good and sufficient reason. Hence the delay occurred in filing application for renewal is condoned.

The vehicle covered by this permit is a four wheeled stage carriage. The Government vide G.O.(P) No 67/2011/Tran dated 30-11-2011 has decided not to issue stage carriage permits to vehicle having four wheels.

This permit renewal application is filed on after the date of expiry belatedly by 65 days. As per G O No 42/2009/TRAN dated 14/07/2009 the permits existed prior to 09/05/2006 will be issued with regular permit after its expiry. In this case since the vehicle is a four wheeler, it is not complying the G.O.(P) No 67/2011/Tran dated 30-11-2011. For the above reasons the application for renewal of permit is rejected.

Item No 51

Heard. The permit was valid up to 20/12/2011 and was issued prior to 09/05/2006. This authority is convinced that the applicant was prevented from filing application for renewal of permit in time due to good and sufficient reason. Hence the delay occurred in filing application for renewal is condoned.

As per clause 4 of notification no 42/2009/TRAN dated 14/07/2009 the regular permit will be issued after the expiry of permits issued prior to 09/05/2006. In this case the permit was issued prior to 09/05/2006. Hence renewal of regular permit granted.

Item No 52

Heard. The permit was valid up to 04.11.2011 and was issued prior to 09/05/2006. This authority is convinced that the applicant was prevented from filing application for renewal of permit in time due to good and sufficient reason. Hence the delay occurred in filing application for renewal is condoned.

As per clause 4 of notification no 42/2009/TRAN dated 14/07/2009 the regular permit will be issued after the expiry of permits issued prior to 09/05/2006. In this case the permit was issued prior to 09/05/2006. Hence renewal of regular permit granted.

Item No 53

Heard. Perused the interim order of Hon'ble High Court in wp© no 2384/2012. In view of the pendency of above writ petition the decision on the application for renewal of permit adjourned.

Item No 54

Heard. Perused the interim order of Hon'ble High Court in wp© no 7026/2012 dated 28/03/2012. In view of the pendency of above writ petition the decision on the application for renewal of permit adjourned.

Item No 55

Heard. The first applicant, the transferor in this case, raised objection against the transfer of permit application and filed written statement of objection. The second applicant or his Counsel could not furnish sustainable contentions or evidences against the objection. Hence this application for transfer of permit is adjourned for settlement of objections between the applicants.

Item No 56

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 57

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 58

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 59

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 60

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 61

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 62

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 63

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 64

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 65

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 66

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 67

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 68

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 69

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 70

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 71

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 72

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 73

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 74

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 75

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 76

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 103

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 104

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 105

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 106

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 107

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 108

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 109

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 110

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 111

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 112

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 113

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 114

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 115

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 116

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 117

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 118

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 119

Heard. Transfer of permit in favor of Smt.Nafeesa, W/O Mohammed, Thazath house, Andiyoorakunnu P.O, Kottappuram, Malappuram is allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 120

Heard. Transfer of permit in favor of Smt.Nafeesa, W/O Mohammed, Thazath house, Andiyoorakunnu P.O, Kottappuram, Malappuram is allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 121

Heard. Transfer of permit in favor of Smt.Nafeesa, W/O Mohammed, Thazath house, Andiyoorakunnu P.O, Kottappuram, Malappuram is allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 122

Heard. Transfer of permit in favor of Smt.Noorjahan, W/O Pocker p, Perappurath kandiyil House, Valluvambaram PO, Malappuram is allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 123

Heard. The applicant used the permit and conducted service without intimation to the Transport Authority regarding his intention to use the permit in the event. Hence there is violation of provisions of Section 82(2) of MV Act and is decide to impose a penalty of Rs. 3000/-.

Transfer of permit in favor of Asraf, S/o Late N Kunhimammed, Nandanil House Chakkiyathil Rd, Thanalur, Pakara, Malappuram Dt is allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 124

Heard. Transfer of permit in favor of Smt.Nafeesa, W/O Mohammed, Thazath house, Andiyoorakunnu P.O, Kottappuram, Malappuram is allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 125

Heard. Transfer of permit in favor of Smt.Nafeesa, W/O Mohammed, Thazath house, Andiyoorkunnu P.O, Kottappuram, Malappuram is allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 126

Heard. Heard. The applicant used the permit and conducted service without intimation to the Transport Authority regarding his intention to use the permit in the event. Hence there is violation of provisions of Section 82(2) of MV Act and is decide to impose a penalty of Rs. 3000/-.

Transfer of permit in favor of Smt. Badariyya, W/o Ashraf(Late), Thumbil House Chullipara, Thirurangadi, Malappuram Dt is allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 127

Heard. This authority is convinced that the offence charged against the vehicle is sustainable and the Counsel appeared for the permit holders could not raise any sustainable contentions against the charge. Hence the permit of the vehicle is liable to be suspended as per Section 86(1) of MV Act.

Considering the gravity of offence it is decided to suspend the permits for a period mentioned in the annexure given below. The permit holder is given with option to remit an amount mentioned in the annexure in lieu of suspension as per Section 86(5) of MV Act.

Secretary is directed to issue notice with time limit for the compliance of the above decision.

Annexure

Serial No	Reg No	No of days of suspension	Amount to be remitted in lieu of suspension
1	KL-10-K-7833	6	3000
2	KL-10-P-7444	6	3000
3	KL-10-S-4140	12	5700
4	KL-55-H-3107	6	3000
5	KL-55-H-4332	6	3000
6	KL-53-A-7849	11	5200

Item No 128

Heard. This authority is convinced that the offence charged against the vehicle is sustainable and the Counsel appeared for the permit holders could not raise any sustainable contentions against the charge and the offences are established as committed. Hence the permit of the vehicle is liable to be suspended as per Section 86(1) of MV Act.

Considering the gravity of offence it is decided to suspend the permits for a period mentioned in the annexure given below. The permit holder is given with option to remit an amount mentioned in the annexure in lieu of suspension as per Section 86(5) of MV Act.

Secretary is directed to issue notice with time limit for the compliance of the above decision.

Annexure

Serial No	Reg No	No of days of suspension	Amount to be remitted in lieu of suspension
1	KL-06-D-5493	8	3800
2	KL-24-A-7145	9	4500
3	KL-65-6516	6	3000
4	KL-10-N-6962	8	4000
5	KL-10-M-6829	6	3000
6	KL-55-4690	10	4800
7	KL-10-Q-9151	7	3500
8	KL-10-R-564	6	3000
9	KL-10-R-576	8	3600
10	KL-55-F-8961	6	3000
11	KL-17-A-5265	7	3500
12	KL-09-M-4208	7	3500

13	KL-10-Q-2744	7	3500
14	KL-02-R-7414	6	3000
15	KL-55-E-5004	6	3000
16	KL-09-P-1440	8	3600

Item No 129

The permit holder absent. The Secretary is directed to serve the notice for hearing and place before next Regional Transport Authority meeting.

Item No 130

Heard. This authority is convinced that the offence charged against the vehicle is sustainable and the Counsel appeared for the permit holders could not raise any sustainable contentions against the charge and the offences are established as committed. Hence the permit of the vehicle is liable to be suspended as per Section 86(1) of MV Act.

Considering the gravity of offence it is decided to suspend the permits for a period mentioned in the annexure given below. The permit holder is given with option to remit an amount mentioned in the annexure in lieu of suspension as per Section 86(5) of MV Act.

Secretary is directed to issue notice with time limit for the compliance of the above decision.

Annexure

Serial No	Reg No	No of days of suspension	Amount to be remitted in lieu of suspension
1	KL-10-AD-3206	8	4000
2	KL-10-U-2397	8	4000
3	KL-10-R-5188	8	3700
4	KL-10-L-1647	10	4600

Item No 131

Heard. This authority is convinced that the offence charged against the vehicle is sustainable and the Counsel appeared for the permit holders could not raise any sustainable contentions against the charge and the offences are established as committed. Hence the permit of the vehicle is liable to be suspended as per Section 86(1) of MV Act.

Considering the gravity of offence it is decided to suspend the permits for a period mentioned in the annexure given below. The permit holder is given with option to remit an amount mentioned in the annexure in lieu of suspension as per Section 86(5) of MV Act.

Secretary is directed to issue notice with time limit for the compliance of the above decision.

Annexure

Serial No	Reg No	No of days of suspension	Amount to be remitted in lieu of suspension
1	KL-10-U-4647	10	4600
2	KL-08-AA-595	9	4500
3	KL-10-Q-9567	7	3400
4	KL-11-Q-9256	6	3000
5	KL-11-S-1630	6	3000
6	KL-11-P-8893	7	3100
7	KL-10-S-3414	9	4500

Item No 132

This authority is convinced that the offence charged against the vehicle is sustainable and the Counsel appeared for the permit holders could not raise any sustainable contentions against the charge. Hence the permit of the vehicle is liable to be suspended as per Section 86(1) of MV Act for the violation of permit condition. Hence the offence under section 192(A) is established and permit is liable to be suspended.

Considering the gravity of offence it is decided to suspend the permit for a period of 10 days. The permit holder is given with option to remit an amount of Rs.5000/- in lieu of suspension as per Section 86(5) of MV Act.

Secretary is directed to issue notice with time limit for the compliance of the above decision.

Item No 133

The re fixation of fare stages requested is on a portion of the main route Tirur – Kottakkal via Iringavoor. The details of the fare stages on the entire route is necessary to take a decision in this matter. Hence the decision on the request is adjourned with direction to Secretary to conduct a detailed enquiry regarding the fare stages on the above route.

Item No 134

Heard. Allowed.

Item No 135

Head. Allowed.

Item No 136

Head. Allowed.

Item No 137

Heard. There is a limited stop bus stop at Valluvangad which is 400 meters near by the proposed bus stop and due to the grant of this bus stop for limited stop services there will be two limited stop service bus stops with in a distance of 400 meters which is not desirable as far as the increase in running time and subsequent possibility of over speeding is considered. It will also create inconvenience to the long distance passengers depending Limited Stop Ordinary services. For the above reasons the request for Bus Stop for Limited Stop services at Valluvangad Angadi is rejected.

Item No 138

Heard. The representative of Ponnundam Grama Panchayath appeared and informed about the interim order of Hon'ble High Court in wp© 4725/2012(M) dated 28/02/2012 with a copy of the interim order. As per the interim order of Hon'ble High Court has directed to keep in abeyance steps if any taken for construction of waiting shed by the Grama Panchayath. In view of the above order the decision on the request for granting permission for Bus waiting shed and Bus bay at Vylathur town is adjourned.

Item No 139

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Karakunnu-34 to Manjeri Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10-Z-4512. As per the decision of RTA dated 21/10/2004 issue of Autorikshaw permits in the municipalities is restricted as it is already over saturated. The restriction was imposed in view of the fact that the parking facility in urban areas are limited. This Autorikshaw is not purchased under any self employment scheme to get any exemption incorporated in the above decision. The secretary is directed to seek the availability of parking area for Autorikshaws in Manjeri municipality and also whether the applicant is a permanent resident of Manjeri municipality. Hence adjourned.

Item No 140

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Vadapuram to Nilambur Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10- AJ-8419. As per the decision of RTA dated 21/10/2004 issue of Autorikshaw permits in the municipalities is restricted as it is already over saturated. The restriction was imposed in view of the fact that the parking facility in urban areas are limited. This Autorikshaw is not purchased under any self employment scheme to get any exemption incorporated in the above decision. The secretary is directed to seek the availability of parking area for Autorikshaws in Nilambur municipality and also whether the applicant is a permanent resident of Nilambur municipality. Hence adjourned.

Item No 141

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Edavanna to Manjeri Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10-S-623. As per the decision of RTA dated 21/10/2004 issue of Autorikshaw permits in the municipalities is restricted as it is already over saturated. The restriction was imposed in view of the fact that the parking facility in urban areas are limited. This Autorikshaw is not purchased under any self employment scheme to get any exemption incorporated in the above decision. The secretary is directed to seek the

availability of parking area for Autorikshaws in Manjeri municipality and also whether the applicant is a permanent resident of Manjeri municipality. Hence adjourned.

Item No 142

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Thalakkadathur to Tirur Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10-L-7283. As per the decision of RTA dated 21/10/2004 issue of Autorikshaw permits in the municipalities is restricted as it is already over saturated. The restriction was imposed in view of the fact that the parking facility in urban areas are limited. This Autorikshaw is not purchased under any self employment scheme to get any exemption incorporated in the above decision. As per intimation dated 16/11/2011 from Tirur Municipality parking places for 10 more Autorikshaws were granted by this Regional Transport Authority. In view of this application Secretary, Regional Transport Authority is directed to seek the availability of parking area for more Autorikshaws in Tirur municipality and also whether the applicant is a permanent resident of Tirur municipality. Hence adjourned.

Item No 143

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Pookottur to Malappuram Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10- AC-9637. As per the decision of RTA dated 21/10/2004 issue of Autorikshaw permits in the municipalities is restricted as it is already over saturated. The restriction was imposed in view of the fact that the parking facility in urban areas are limited. This Autorikshaw is not purchased under any self employment scheme to get any exemption incorporated in the above decision. The secretary is directed to seek the availability of parking area for Autorikshaws in Malappuram municipality and also whether the applicant is a permanent resident of Malappuram municipality. Hence adjourned.

Item No 144

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Karakunnu to Manjeri Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10-AA-9722. As per the decision of RTA dated 21/10/2004 issue of Autorikshaw permits in the municipalities is restricted as it is already over saturated. The restriction was imposed in view of the fact that the parking facility in urban areas are limited. This Autorikshaw is not purchased under any self employment scheme to get any exemption incorporated in the above decision. The secretary is directed to seek the availability of parking area for Autorikshaws in Manjeri municipality and also whether the applicant is a permanent resident of Manjeri municipality. Hence adjourned.

Item No 145

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Amayur Road to Manjeri Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-55-C-8579. As per the decision of RTA dated 21/10/2004 issue of Autorikshaw permits in the municipalities is restricted as it is already over saturated. The restriction was imposed in view of the fact that the parking facility in urban areas are limited. This Autorikshaw is not purchased under any self employment scheme to get any exemption incorporated in the above decision. The secretary is directed to seek the availability of parking area for Autorikshaws in Manjeri municipality and also whether the applicant is a permanent resident of Manjeri municipality. Hence adjourned.

Item No 146

Heard. This is an application for fresh permit with parking place at Malappuram Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10- AK-4079. As per the decision of RTA dated 21/10/2004 issue of Autorikshaw permits in the municipalities is restricted as it is already over saturated. The restriction was imposed in view of the fact that the parking facility in urban areas are limited. This Autorikshaw is not purchased under any self employment scheme to get any exemption incorporated in the above decision. The secretary is directed to seek the availability of parking area for Autorikshaws in Malappuram municipality and also whether the applicant is a permanent resident of Malappuram municipality. Hence adjourned.

Item No 147

Heard. This is an application for fresh permit at Tirur municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL 55 J 8083. As per the report of Joint RTO, Tirur this Autorikshaw was purchased with the financial aid

of Kerala State Backward Classes Development Corporation, Malappuram unit under self employment scheme. Hence the applicant is eligible for exemption from the decision of RTA dated 21/10/2004 restricting Autorikshaw permit in municipalities. Hence fresh Autorikshaw permit granted with parking place at available parking area reported by Secretary, Tirur Municipality.

Item No 148

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Thalakkadathur to Tirur Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10-L-7283. As per the decision of RTA dated 21/10/2004 issue of Autorikshaw permits in the municipalities is restricted as it is already over saturated. The restriction was imposed in view of the fact that the parking facility in urban areas are limited. This Autorikshaw is not purchased under any self employment scheme to get any exemption incorporated in the above decision. As per intimation dated 16/11/2011 from Tirur Municipality parking places for 10 more Autorikshaws were granted by this Regional Transport Authority. In view of this application Secretary, Regional Transport Authority is directed to seek the availability of parking area for more Autorikshaws in Tirur municipality and also whether the applicant is a permanent resident of Tirur municipality. Hence adjourned.

Item No 149

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Amayur Road to Manjeri Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10-AA-7109. As per the decision of RTA dated 21/10/2004 issue of Autorikshaw permits in the municipalities is restricted as it is already over saturated. The restriction was imposed in view of the fact that the parking facility in urban areas are limited. This Autorikshaw is not purchased under any self employment scheme to get any exemption incorporated in the above decision. The secretary is directed to seek the availability of parking area for Autorikshaws in Manjeri municipality and also whether the applicant is a permanent resident of Manjeri municipality. Hence adjourned.

Item No 150

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Kodur to Malappuram Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10- AD-7288. As per the decision of RTA dated 21/10/2004 issue of Autorikshaw permits in the municipalities is restricted as it is already over saturated. The restriction was imposed in view of the fact that the parking facility in urban areas are limited. This Autorikshaw is not purchased under any self employment scheme to get any exemption incorporated in the above decision. The secretary is directed to seek the availability of parking area for Autorikshaws in Malappuram municipality and also whether the applicant is a permanent resident of Malappuram municipality. Hence adjourned.

Item No 151

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Pulloor to Tirur Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-55-D-6147. As per the decision of RTA dated 21/10/2004 issue of Autorikshaw permits in the municipalities is restricted as it is already over saturated. The restriction was imposed in view of the fact that the parking facility in urban areas are limited. This Autorikshaw is not purchased under any self employment scheme to get any exemption incorporated in the above decision. As per intimation dated 16/11/2011 from Tirur Municipality parking places for 10 more Autorikshaws were granted by this Regional Transport Authority. In view of this application Secretary, Regional Transport Authority is directed to seek the availability of parking area for more Autorikshaws in Tirur municipality. Hence adjourned.

Item No 152

Heard.

1. Perused the judgment of Hon'ble STAT in MVARP 276/2011
2. In obedience to the above judgment the variation of permit by changing parking place from Mongam to Kondotty in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10-AA-5412 is granted.

Item No 153

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Thalakkadathur to Tirur Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-13-M-7345. As per the decision of RTA dated 21/10/2004 issue of Autorikshaw permits in the municipalities is restricted as it is

already over saturated. The restriction was imposed in view of the fact that the parking facility in urban areas are limited. This Autorikshaw is not purchased under any self employment scheme to get any exemption incorporated in the above decision. As per intimation dated 16/11/2011 from Tirur Municipality parking places for 10 more Autorikshaws were granted by this Regional Transport Authority. In view of this application Secretary, Regional Transport Authority is directed to seek the availability of parking area for more Autorikshaws in Tirur municipality and also whether the applicant is a permanent resident of Tirur municipality. Hence adjourned.

Item No 154

Heard. This applicant has availed loan in KESRU self employment scheme for the purchase of A/R KL-10-AF-2445 and found as eligible for exemption from the decision of this RTA dated 21/10/2004. Hence the change of halting place from Thrikkalagode to Manjeri is granted subject to the parking place availability report of Secretary, Manjeri Municipality.

Item No 155

Heard. Perused judgment in 22157/2011 dated 17/10/2011 of Hon'ble High Court and suggestions raised in the meeting held by Secretary in which the petitioners and respondents in the above writ petition were present. In view of the suggestions and enquiry report of JRTO, Tirurangadi in order to resolve the existing problems connected with Autorikshaw parking and Bus stops it is decided as follows.

1. To avoid Autorikshaw parking in the existing Autorikshaw parking place at Kakkanchery junction and to declare that portion as no parking area.
2. To bifurcate the Autorikshaw stand at Kakkanchery and to shift to two places, a) in front of Kinfra and b) to a suitable place beyond the bus stop towards Kozhikkode side.
3. To shift the existing bus stop towards Thrissur side to a place opposite to Kinfra towards Thrissur side beyond Pallikkal road.

It is also directed to avoid obstruction for entry to the Kinfra and other institutions if any while marking the Autorikshaw parking place and providing bus stop as per this decision.

Item No 156

Granted concurrence for renewal of regular permit without prejudice to the right of the primary authority to decide the class of service and subject to GO (P) No. 42/2009/TRAN dtd 14.7.2009 and the disposal of WP© 20520/2009 and 22196/2009 of Hon'ble High Court.

Item No 157

Granted concurrence for renewal of regular permit without prejudice to the right of the primary authority to decide the class of service and subject to GO (P) No. 42/2009/TRAN dtd 14.7.2009 and the disposal of WP© 20520/2009 and 22196/2009 of Hon'ble High Court.

Item No 158

Granted concurrence for renewal of regular permit without prejudice to the right of the primary authority to decide the class of service and subject to GO (P) No. 42/2009/TRAN dtd 14.7.2009 and the disposal of WP© 20520/2009 and 22196/2009 of Hon'ble High Court.

Item No 159

Granted concurrence for renewal of regular permit without prejudice to the right of the primary authority to decide the class of service and subject to GO (P) No. 42/2009/TRAN dtd 14.7.2009 and the disposal of WP© 20520/2009 and 22196/2009 of Hon'ble High Court.

Item No 160

Granted concurrence for renewal of regular permit without prejudice to the right of the primary authority to decide the class of service and subject to GO (P) No. 42/2009/TRAN dtd 14.7.2009 and the disposal of WP© 20520/2009 and 22196/2009 of Hon'ble High Court.

Item No 161

Granted concurrence for renewal of regular permit without prejudice to the right of the primary authority to decide the class of service and subject to GO (P) No. 42/2009/TRAN dtd 14.7.2009 and the disposal of WP© 20520/2009 and 22196/2009 of Hon'ble High Court.

Item No 175

Granted concurrence for renewal of regular permit without prejudice to the right of the primary authority to decide the class of service and subject to GO (P) No. 42/2009/TRAN dtd 14.7.2009 and the disposal of WP© 20520/2009 and 22196/2009 of Hon'ble High Court.

Item No 176

Granted concurrence for renewal of regular permit without prejudice to the right of the primary authority to decide the class of service and subject to GO (P) No. 42/2009/TRAN dtd 14.7.2009 and the disposal of WP© 20520/2009 and 22196/2009 of Hon'ble High Court.

Item No 177

Granted concurrence for renewal of regular permit without prejudice to the right of the primary authority to decide the class of service and subject to GO (P) No. 42/2009/TRAN dtd 14.7.2009 and the disposal of WP© 20520/2009 and 22196/2009 of Hon'ble High Court.

Item No 178

Granted concurrence for renewal of regular permit without prejudice to the right of the primary authority to decide the class of service and subject to GO (P) No. 42/2009/TRAN dtd 14.7.2009 and the disposal of WP© 20520/2009 and 22196/2009 of Hon'ble High Court.

Item No 179

Granted concurrence for renewal of regular permit without prejudice to the right of the primary authority to decide the class of service and subject to GO (P) No. 42/2009/TRAN dtd 14.7.2009 and the disposal of WP© 20520/2009 and 22196/2009 of Hon'ble High Court.

Item No 180

Granted concurrence for renewal of regular permit without prejudice to the right of the primary authority to decide the class of service and subject to GO (P) No. 42/2009/TRAN dtd 14.7.2009 and the disposal of WP© 20520/2009 and 22196/2009 of Hon'ble High Court.

Item No 181

Granted concurrence for renewal of regular permit without prejudice to the right of the primary authority to decide the class of service and subject to GO (P) No. 42/2009/TRAN dtd 14.7.2009 and the disposal of WP© 20520/2009 and 22196/2009 of Hon'ble High Court.

Item No 182

Granted concurrence for renewal of regular permit without prejudice to the right of the primary authority to decide the class of service and subject to GO (P) No. 42/2009/TRAN dtd 14.7.2009 and the disposal of WP© 20520/2009 and 22196/2009 of Hon'ble High Court.

Item No 183

Granted concurrence for renewal of regular permit without prejudice to the right of the primary authority to decide the class of service and subject to GO (P) No. 42/2009/TRAN dtd 14.7.2009 and the disposal of WP© 20520/2009 and 22196/2009 of Hon'ble High Court.

Item No 184

Granted concurrence for renewal of regular permit without prejudice to the right of the primary authority to decide the class of service and subject to GO (P) No. 42/2009/TRAN dtd 14.7.2009 and the disposal of WP© 20520/2009 and 22196/2009 of Hon'ble High Court.

Item No 185

Granted concurrence for renewal of regular permit without prejudice to the right of the primary authority to decide the class of service and subject to GO (P) No. 42/2009/TRAN dtd 14.7.2009 and the disposal of WP© 20520/2009 and 22196/2009 of Hon'ble High Court.

Departmental Item No: 1

Ratified the work done by Secretary, RTA under delegated powers.

Supplementary Item No: 1

Heard.

1. Perused the judgment in WP(C) 4547/2012 dated 06/03/2012 of Hon'ble High Court.
2. In obedience to the judgment of Hon'ble Court the application for fresh regular permit is considered. The route applied is Kadampuzha Temple – Perintalmanna (via) Valanchery. The secretary has not furnished any details of the route and timings proposed by the applicant so as

to comply with the direction of STA issued vide order no D3/875/STA/2005 dated 08/11/2011. In view of the notification no 42/2009/TRAN dated 14/07/2009 this application can be granted only in compliance with the said notification and no body can make a claim to grant the surrendered permit in his favour without complying the conditions of the notification. The surrender of permit by the S/C KL-53-A-2762 was on 07/09/2011 while the notification no 42/2009/TRAN was in force. The RTA has to ascertain the overlapping of the proposed route on the nationalized and notified route and compliance of notification no 42/2009/TRAN dated 14/07/2009, number of wheels of the vehicle offered etc. Hence the decision of the application is adjourned with direction to the Secretary to conduct route enquiry and furnish relevant details including those mentioned above.

Supplementary Item No: 2

1. Perused the judgment in wp© 2179/2012 dated 30/01/2012 of Hon'ble High Court.
2. In obedience to the judgment of Hon'ble High Court in WP© 2179/2012 considered the application for conversion of service from Limited Stop Ordinary Service to Limited Stop Fast Passenger and rejected for the following reasons.
 - a) The route length of this service is 128kms only and permit is valid up to 10.09.2012. An Ordinary Service can be operated up to 140kms as per rule 2 (0a) of KMVR. Hence nature of this service can be continued as an ordinary service as per the existing rules. The route length does not necessitate the conversion of service as Fast Passenger Service for its existence.
 - b) The KSRTC vehemently objected the conversion of the service as Fast Passenger Service as the major portion of the route overlaps on the notified route and the conversion of the service will adversely affect their similar services on this sector.
 - c) As per the notification No. 42/2009/TRAN dated 14.07.2009 the right to operate any new service is reserved exclusively to State Transport Undertaking only. If the conversion of service as Fast Passenger Service is granted it will result as an introduction of a new service and will violate the above said notification.
 - d) Stops will be reduced, students depending this service on various portions of its route will be deprived of their concessional rate Traveling facility.
 - e) The daily commuters on various portions of this service will have to pay higher rate of fare without availing any additional facilities.
 - f) The variation proposed is not in compliance with the provisions of Section 80(3) of MV Act regarding the convenience of the travelling public.

Supplementary Item No: 3

Heard. This is an application for conversion of service from Limited Stop Ordinary Service to Limited Stop Fast Passenger Service. The route length of this service is 141kms only and permit is valid up to 03.05.2015. This authority considered the application for variation by conversion of nature of service as Fast Passenger and rejected for the following reasons.

- a) The KSRTC vehemently objected the conversion of the service as Fast Passenger Service as the major portion of the route overlaps on the notified route and the conversion of the service will adversely affect their similar services on this sector.
- b) As per the notification No. 42/2009/TRAN dated 14.07.2009 the right to operate any new service is reserved exclusively to State Transport Undertaking only. If the conversion of service as Fast Passenger Service is granted it will result as introduction of a new service and will violate the above said notification.
- c) Stops will be reduced, students depending this service on various portions of its route will be deprived of their concessional rate Traveling facility.
- d) The daily commuters on various portions of this service will have to pay higher rate of fare without availing any additional facilities.
- e) The variation proposed is not in compliance with the provisions of Section 80(3) of MV Act regarding the convenience of the travelling public.

Supplementary Item No: 4

1. Perused the judgment in wp© 3384/2012 dated 03/04/2012 of Hon'ble High Court.
2. In obedience to the judgment of Hon'ble High Court in WP© 3384/2012 considered the application for conversion of service from Limited Stop Ordinary Service to Limited Stop Fast Passenger and rejected for the following reasons.
 - a) The route length of this service is 128kms only and permit is valid up to 10.09.2012. An Ordinary Service can be operated up to 140kms as per rule 2 (0a) of KMVR. Hence nature of this service can be continued as an ordinary service as per the existing rules. The route length does not necessitate the conversion of service as Fast Passenger Service for its existence.
 - b) The KSRTC vehemently objected the conversion of the service as Fast Passenger Service as the major portion of the route overlaps on the notified route and the conversion of the service will adversely affect their similar services on this sector.
 - c) As per the notification No. 42/2009/TRAN dated 14.07.2009 the right to operate any new service is reserved exclusively to State Transport Undertaking only. If the conversion of service as Fast Passenger Service is granted it will result as introduction of a new service and will violate the above said notification.
 - d) Stops will be reduced, students depending this service on various portions of its route will be deprived of their concessional rate Traveling facility.
 - e) The daily commuters on various portions of this service will have to pay higher rate of fare without availing any additional facilities.
 - f) The variation proposed is not in compliance with the provisions of Section 80(3) of MV Act regarding the convenience of the travelling public.

Supplementary Item No: 5

Heard. This is an application for conversion of service from Limited Stop Ordinary Service to Limited Stop Fast Passenger Service. The route length of this service is 141kms only and permit is valid up to 06.11.2012. This authority considered the application for variation by conversion of nature of service as Fast Passenger and rejected for the following reasons.

- a) The KSRTC vehemently objected the conversion of the service as Fast Passenger Service as the major portion of the route overlaps on the notified route and the conversion of the service will adversely affect their similar services on this sector.
- b) As per the notification No. 42/2009/TRAN dated 14.07.2009 the right to operate any new service is reserved exclusively to State Transport Undertaking only. If the conversion of service as Fast Passenger Service is granted it will result as introduction of a new service and will violate the above said notification.
- c) Stops will be reduced, students depending this service on various portions of its route will be deprived of their concessional rate Traveling facility.
- d) The daily commuters on various portions of this service will have to pay higher rate of fare without availing any additional facilities.
- e) The variation proposed is not in compliance with the provisions of Section 80(3) of MV Act regarding the convenience of the travelling public.

Supplementary Item No: 6

Heard. This is an application for conversion of service from Limited Stop Ordinary Service to Limited Stop Fast Passenger Service. The route length of this service is 147kms only and permit is valid up to 30.08.2013. This authority considered the application for variation by conversion of nature of service as Fast Passenger and rejected for the following reasons.

- a) The KSRTC vehemently objected the conversion of the service as Fast Passenger Service as the major portion of the route overlaps on the notified route and the conversion of the service will adversely affect their similar services on this sector.
- b) As per the notification No. 42/2009/TRAN dated 14.07.2009 the right to operate any new service is reserved exclusively to State Transport Undertaking only. If the conversion of

service as Fast Passenger Service is granted it will result as introduction of a new service and will violate the above said notification.

- c) Stops will be reduced, students depending this service on various portions of its route will be deprived of their concessional rate Traveling facility.
- d) The daily commuters on various portions of this service will have to pay higher rate of fare without availing any additional facilities.
- e) The variation proposed is not in compliance with the provisions of Section 80(3) of MV Act regarding the convenience of the travelling public.

Supplementary Item No: 7

Heard. Perused the interim order of Hon'ble High Court in wp© no 8226/2012. In view of the pendency of above writ petition the decision on the application for renewal of permit adjourned.

Supplementary Item No: 8

Heard both the applicants and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Supplementary Item No:9

Heard. Transfer of permit in favor of Smt. Jameela P K, W/O Hassan, Melekottaparambath house, Ayikkarappadi P.O, Pulikkal is allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Supplementary Item No:10

Granted concurrence for renewal of regular permit without prejudice to the right of the primary authority to decide the class of service and subject to GO (P) No. 42/2009/TRAN dtd 14.7.2009 and the disposal of WP© 20520/2009 and 22196/2009 of Hon'ble High Court.

Supplementary Item No:11

Granted concurrence for renewal of regular permit without prejudice to the right of the primary authority to decide the class of service and subject to GO (P) No. 42/2009/TRAN dtd 14.7.2009 and the disposal of WP© 20520/2009 and 22196/2009 of Hon'ble High Court.

Supplementary Item No:12

Granted concurrence for renewal of regular permit without prejudice to the right of the primary authority to decide the class of service and subject to GO (P) No. 42/2009/TRAN dtd 14.7.2009 and the disposal of WP© 20520/2009 and 22196/2009 of Hon'ble High Court.

Supplementary Item No:13

Granted concurrence for renewal of regular permit without prejudice to the right of the primary authority to decide the class of service and subject to GO (P) No. 42/2009/TRAN dtd 14.7.2009 and the disposal of WP© 20520/2009 and 22196/2009 of Hon'ble High Court.

Supplementary Item No:14

Heard. This authority is convinced that the offences charged against each vehicle are sustainable and the Counsel appeared for the permit holders could not raise any sustainable contentions against the charge and the offences are established as committed. Hence the permit of the vehicle is liable to be suspended as per Section 86(1) of MV Act.

Considering the gravity of offence it is decided to suspend the permits for a period mentioned in the annexure given below. The permit holder is given with option to remit an amount mentioned in the annexure in lieu of suspension as per Section 86(5) of MV Act.

Secretary is directed to issue notice with time limit for the compliance of the above decision.

Annexure

Serial No	Reg No	No of days of suspension	Amount to be remitted in lieu of suspension
1	KL-10-X-4074	8	4000
2	KL-10-L-6890	7	3500
3	KL-09-K-1882	7	3500
4	KL-10-AA-7077	8	4000
5	KL-53-8332	6	3000
6	KL-54-2268	7	3500
7	KL-53-100	9	4500
8	KL-10-P-6941	7	3500

Supplementary Item No:15

This authority is convinced that the offence charged against the vehicle is sustainable and the Counsel appeared for the permit holders could not raise any sustainable contentions against the charge. The offences charged in the check reports dated 12/05/2010, 24/07/2011 & 23/11/2011 are regarding the curtailment of trips and are repeated offences under section 192(A) of MV Act. The offences are established and hence the permit is liable to be suspended.

Considering the gravity of offence it is decided to suspend the permit for a period of 10 days for each check report. The permit holder is given with option to remit an amount of Rs.5000/- on each check report in lieu of suspension.

Secretary is directed to issue notice with time limit for the compliance of the above decision.

Supplementary Item No:16

Secretary is allowed to seek concurrence from Sister RTA, Palakkad.

Supplementary Item No:17

Heard. Perused the judgment in WP© 8842/2012 of Hon'ble High Court. In obedience to the judgment of Hon'ble Court considered the application for fresh regular permit filed on 12/03/2012 to the Secretary. The enquiry process regarding the overlapping on notified route, route length, running time and its compliance with the order of STA No. D3/875/STA/2005 dated 08/11/2011, of the proposed route is progressing with the office of the Secretary for which a reasonable time is required. The above enquiry report is essential for factual decision on this application. It is also noticed that the applicant has misrepresented before the Hon'ble Court to create a feeling that the applicant's application was filed on 30/10/2011 and is pending from that date onwards suppressing the actual fact that the application was filed only on 12/03/2012. In the above circumstances the decision on this application for fresh regular permit is adjourned with a direction to the Secretary to place the application on the next RTA meeting itself with all relevant details connected with the application.

Supplementary Item No:18

Heard. This authority had earlier adjourned this matter for a detailed feasibility enquiry regarding the suggestions of the petitioner. The field enquiry revealed that the changes in traffic system due to the implementation of the suggestions of the petitioner will adversely affect the convenience of the passengers and road safety. The enquiry report also points to the possibility of danger to the public and passengers due to the implementation of the suggestions of the petitioner. Hence it is decided to continue the existing traffic system in the present circumstances.

Sd/-

Sri. M.C. Mohandas, I.A.S.

District Collector & Chairman RTA Malappuram

Sd/-

Sri. K. Sethuraman, I.P.S.

Superintendent of Police Malappuram & Member RTA Malappuram

Sd/-

Sri. P V Varghese

Deputy Transport Commissioner, CZ-I, Thrissur &
Member RTA Malappuram