

**Decision of RTA, Malappuram held at Collectorate Conference Hall on  
23/08/2012**

**Item No 1**

Heard.

1. Even though this authority sought for necessary concurrence from RTA, Palakkad and obtained the same, the applicant could not offer a vehicle as informed by him in the application for regular permit filed by him even after the lapse of a reasonable time.
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 obliged as per section 70(1)(b)&(f) of MV Act 1988 .
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.

For the compliance of above matters the decision on the application for regular stage carriage permit is **adjourned**.

**Item No 2**

Heard.

1. Perused the judgment dated 10/07/2012 of Hon'ble High Court in wp© 14518/2012.
2. Considered the application for regular permit on the route Tirur – Tirur via Pookkayil in obedience to the judgment of Hon'ble High Court in wp © No.14518/2012. Where in the Hon'ble High Court has viewed that the petitioner need produce a vehicle only on being directed to produce the current records there of, after the grant of permit. The Hon'ble Court has also held that it is not necessary for the petitioner to have a ready vehicle at the time of submitting an application for the grant of the permit. In this case this authority has earlier considered the application filed by the applicant even the particulars of the vehicle proposed to operate on the route was not furnished in the application. The decision on the application was adjourned to give an opportunity to furnish the particulars of the vehicle at least before the grant of the permit, which is a mandatory requirement. The said adjournment was in view of the GO(P)No67/2011/Tran dtd 30-11-2011 by which the Government have discontinued the grant of stage carriage permit to vehicles having only four wheels. In view of the above said notification this authority is bound to ensure that the stage carriage permit is granted only to a six wheeled stage carriage having particulars specified by the applicant as prescribed in the application form. Under the provisions of Section 70(1) (f) of MV Act 1988 the State Government have prescribed the matters to be furnished in respect of the vehicle proposed to operate as stage carriage in the application form prescribed under rule 143(a) of KMV Rules 1989. As per the provisions of Section 70(1)(b) & (f) of MV Act and for the requirements of Section 71 and Section 72 of MV Act 1988 , the applicant is legally obliged to furnish all particulars of the vehicle before the actual grant of the permit. But the applicant did not furnish any particulars of the vehicle even at time of subsequent hearing in this matter for grant of permit by this authority which was a mandatory requirement. The Hon'ble Court in a case between Natarajan Vs STAT reported as 1999(1) KLT SN10 CN11 has held that furnishing of all the particulars of the vehicle before the actual grant of permit is a mandatory requirement.

For the above reasons the application for grant of regular stage carriage permit is **rejected**.

**Item No 3**

Heard.

1. The 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 grant of permit for which the applicant is obliged as per section 70(1)(b)&(f) of MV Act.
3. Furnishing of all the particulars of the vehicle before the actual grant is a mandatory requirement as per law.

For the compliance of above decision on the application for regular stage carriage permit is **adjourned**.

#### **Item No 4**

Heard.

1. The 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 obliged as per section 70(1)(b) & (f) of MV Act.
3. Furnishing of all the particulars of the vehicle before the actual grant is a mandatory requirement as per law.
4. Proposed route overlaps on distance of 19kms from Vanneri to Chamravattom Bridge on the notified route Kottayam – Kozhikkode vide notification no. 42/2009/TRAN dated 14/07/2009 and the overlapping distance is 57.5 % of the proposed route length. Hence violate clause 5(c) of the above said notification.

For the above reasons the application for grant of regular stage carriage permit is **rejected**.

#### **Item No 5**

Heard.

1. Perused the judgment dated 09/04/2012 of Hon'ble High Court in wp© 8842/2012.
2. The application for regular permit on the route Devdhar Higher Secondary School to Kavilakkad via Tirur is considered. The applicant in his letter dated 30/11/2011 submitted on 12/03/2012 along with the application for regular permit had stated that the permit is applied for the convenience of the traveling public and students. But on perusal of time schedule proposed only the starting and halting trips at 7.17am and 9.25pm only are provided to the Devadhar Higher Secondary School which is a terminus of the route and those timings are not useful to the students and Staff. No other trips useful for the students and public to this school is seen provided. Hence the reason furnished for seeking grant of the permit is not complying and the application for regular permit is **rejected**.

#### **Item No 6**

Heard. The regular permit **granted** in respect of S/C KL 12 B 2588 subject to settlement of timings, verification of genuineness of vehicle offered and confirming the compliance of GO(P)No67/2011/Tran dtd 30/11/2011

#### **Item No 7**

Heard. The applicant offered six wheeled S/C KL-07-AE-2085 and regular permit **granted** subject to the settlement of timings, verification of genuineness of vehicle offered and confirming the compliance of GO(P)No67/2011/Tran dtd 30/11/2011

#### **Item No 8**

Heard. The applicant offered six wheeled S/C KL-12-B-3160 and regular permit **granted** subject to the settlement of timings, verification of genuineness of vehicle offered and confirming the compliance of GO(P)No67/2011/Tran dtd 30/11/2011

#### **Item No 9**

Heard.

1. The vehicle offered by the applicant is not registered in his name.
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 obliged as per section 70(1)(b)&(f) of MV Act.
3. Furnishing of all the particulars of the vehicle before the actual grant is a mandatory requirement as per law.

For the compliance of above decision on the application for regular stage carriage permit is **adjourned**.

#### **Item No 10**

Heard. This is an application for regular permit in respect of a S/C KL-10-T-5199. The S/C KL-10-T-5199 is having a regular permit on the route Pilakkal – Manjeri (touching Pandikkad, Cheruvatti, Vettikkattiri & Perimbalam) via Valluvangad, Mukkam, Amayamkode, Chengana, Malamkulam, Choyiyath, Cherukulam, Nellikuth with Manjeri – Manjeri one round trip via Chengana, Amayamcode, Kavalangad which is almost similar to the applied route. In the event of grant of this permit the existing permit will be surrendered causing inconvenience to the existing traveling public. Hence this authority is convinced that the grant of this regular permit application will result as a grant of variation of the S/C KL-10-T-5199 and the applicant is trying to obtain a variation of the existing permit in guise of a fresh permit. This will adversely affect the existing traveling public utilizing the service by the S/C KL-10-T-5199.

In the above circumstances the application for fresh regular permit in respect of six wheeled S/C KL-10-T-5199 is **rejected**.

#### **Item No 11**

The applicant offered S/C KL-10-R-8969. But the time schedule proposed is lacking clarity and conformity with the route proposed. As per the application the route shall pass through an intermediate place Mini Kappil and the same is shown in the route sketch. The time schedule proposed not showing any trip through Mini Kappil. Hence the decision on the application is **adjourned** with direction to modify time schedule providing more trips through the terminus OKM Nagar and trips through Mini Kappil.

#### **Item No 12**

Heard.

1. The vehicle offered by the applicant is not registered in his name.
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 MV Act.

3. Furnishing of all the particulars of the vehicle before the actual grant is a mandatory requirement as per law.
4. There is a virgin portion of 1.1 kms for which road fitness certificate is not received.

For the compliance of above decision on the application for regular stage carriage permit is **adjourned**.

#### **Item No 13**

Heard.

1. The vehicle offered by the applicant is not registered in his name.
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 MV Act.

3. Furnishing of all the particulars of the vehicle before the actual grant is a mandatory requirement as per law.

For the compliance of above decision on the application for regular stage carriage permit is **adjourned**.

#### **Item No 14**

Heard. The applicant offered six wheeled S/C KL-17-A-3874 and regular permit **granted** subject to the settlement of timings, verification of genuineness of vehicle offered and confirming the compliance of GO(P)No67/2011/Tran dtd 30/11/2011

#### **Item No 15**

Heard. The applicant offered vehicle S/C KL-10-Z-2756. This is an application for regular permit on the route Vilayil – Vekkode via Elamkavu, Areacode, Therattammal, Poovathikkal claiming the vacant timings of S/C KL-12-A-5659. But the permit pertaining to the claimed set of timings is not surrendered so far and the timings are not declared as vacant. In this circumstance the applicant is directed to furnish fresh set of clash free timings in compliance with the order no. D3/875/STA/2005 dated 08/11/2011 of STA.

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

#### **Item No 16**

Heard. The applicant offered vehicle S/C KL-10-Z-8690. This is an application for regular permit on the route Manjeri – Pandikkad via Anakkayam , Pulliyilangadi, Panthloor claiming the vacant timings of S/C KL-10-AA-622. But the permit pertaining to the claimed set of timings is not surrendered so far and the timings are not declared as vacant. In this circumstance the applicant is directed to furnish fresh set of clash free timings in compliance with the order no. D3/875/STA/2005 dated 08/11/2011 of STA.

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

#### **Item No 17**

Heard. This is an inter district route and a portion of the route from Oorkkadavu to Kozhikkode on a distance of 17.5kms lies in Kozhikkode Dist. Hence the concurrence of that RTA is necessary for

grant of regular permit on the applied route and the Secretary is directed to seek concurrence from RTA, Kozhikkode with request to provide the details of overlapping on notified in that jurisdiction by the proposed route. Hence **adjourned**.

#### **Item No 18**

Heard. This is an application for regular permit in respect of a S/C KL-10-Q-2940. The S/C KL-10-Q-2940 is having a regular permit on the route Erumamunda – Kaippinikkadavu via Kurumbalangode, Kolompadam & Koomanthode which is almost similar to the applied route. In the event of grant of this permit the existing permit will be surrendered causing inconvenience to the existing traveling public. Hence this authority is convinced that the grant of this regular permit application will result as a grant of variation of the S/C KL-10-Q-2940 and the applicant is trying to obtain a variation of the existing permit in guise of a fresh permit. This will adversely affect the existing traveling public utilizing the service now conducted by the S/C KL-10-Q-2940.

In the above circumstances the application for fresh regular permit in respect of S/C KL-10-Q-2940 is **rejected**.

#### **Item No 19**

Heard. This is an application for regular permit in respect of a S/C KL-18-A-1060. The S/C KL-18-A-1060 is having a regular permit on the route Vettom- Koottai Azhimugham – Chemmad with two additional trip between Unniyal – Koottai Azhimugham via Paravanna, Mangalam Jn via Koottaikadavu, which is almost similar to the applied route. In the event of grant of this permit the existing permit is proposed to surrender as revealed by the applicant before this RTA. This authority is convinced that the grant of this regular permit application will result as a grant of variation of the S/C KL-18-A-1060 and the applicant is trying to obtain a variation of the existing permit in guise of a fresh permit. This will adversely affect the existing traveling public utilizing the service now conducted by the S/C KL-18-A-1060.

In the above circumstances the application for fresh regular permit in respect of S/C KL-18-A-1060 is **rejected**.

#### **Item No 20**

Heard.

1. The proposed variation will cause to increase number of trips through notified portion Cherani to Karakunnu of notified route Vazhikkadavu – Kozhikkode and is the violation of clause 19 of notification No. 42/2009/TRAN dated 14/07/2009.

2. The deviation sought for is through a well served area and no special additional need of service through that sector is reported by the field officer in his report.

3. The proposed deviation of the existing trip will result in the withdrawal of existing traveling facility utilized by the public of the route portion through Elamkur and will adversely affect the traveling public of that area.

For the above reasons the variation proposed is not found satisfying for the convenience of traveling public as laid down in proviso to sub section 3(ii) of Section 80 of MV Act 1988 and is found more disadvantages to the traveling public. Hence the variation application is **rejected**.

#### **Item No 21**

Heard

1. The rearrangement of trips proposed in the variation application is found resulted in the elimination of the existing service trips utilized by the traveling public from Arimbra area at the early morning time and to University at office time which were highly beneficial to the traveling public, in the guise of providing extension of the route through Thangal's road and Ozhukur.

2. The extension is not seen provided on the timings beneficial to the students and the shifting of existing trip from Arimbra at 5.55 am to 3.30 am is not at all going to be beneficial to the traveling

public of Arimbra area and will only result in the elimination of existing trip at 5.55 am from Arimbra to Kondotty.

For the above reasons the variation proposed is not found satisfying for the convenience of traveling public as laid down in proviso to sub section 3(ii) of Section 80 of MV Act and is found more disadvantages to the traveling public. Hence the variation application is **rejected**.

#### **Item No 22**

Heard.

1. The time schedule proposed is not in conformity with the variation application. As per the application 5 single trips starting from Kondotty is proposed to deviate via Kodangad but in the proposed time schedule it is not specified the path of return trips.

2. The field officer has reported that the curtailment will adversely affect the existing traveling public depending this service and has not reported any advantage by the proposed variation.

For the above reasons this authority found that the variation proposed is not satisfying the convenience of traveling public as laid down in proviso to sub section 3 (ii) of Section 80 of MV Act and is found more disadvantages to the traveling public. Hence the variation application is **rejected**.

#### **Item No 23:-**

Heard.

1. The proposed variation will cause to increase the number of trips on the notified portion from Malappuram to Down hill on the notified route Palakkad – Kozhikkode vide notification No. 42/2009/TRAN dated 14/07/2009 and is the violation of clause 19 of above said notification.

2. The proposed shifting of trip at 3.45 pm to Pottikallu from Kottakkal will result in the elimination of that trip and will adversely affect the traveling public and students.

3. The additional trip is proposed between Malappuram and Kottakkal which is well served by KSRTC and other private bus operators.

For the above reasons this authority found that the variation proposed is not satisfying the convenience of traveling public as laid down in proviso to sub section 3(ii) of Section 80 of MV Act and is found more disadvantages to the traveling public. Hence the variation application is **rejected**.

#### **Item No 24:-**

Heard. The objectors alleged that the timings existing and proposed given in the agenda is not correct and is confronted with item no 25. Hence decision on the application is **adjourned** for the verification by the Secretary and to place before next Regional Transport Authority meeting.

#### **Item No 25**

Heard. The objectors alleged that the timings furnished are same as that in item no 24 and requested for adjournment. Hence decision on the application is **adjourned** for the verification by the Secretary and to place before next Regional Transport Authority meeting.

#### **Item No 26**

Heard.

1. The variation proposed includes the shifting of existing trip from Edappal to Biyyamkett via Athani now at 3.34 pm to 7 pm. This variation will seriously affect the students & traveling public, since the existing trip is to a comparatively ill served area.

2. The general public, student unions, local body members of that area raised vehement objections against the proposed variation on the above ground.

For the above reasons this authority found that the variation proposed is not satisfying the convenience of traveling public as laid down in proviso to sub section 3 (ii) of Section 80 of MV Act and is found more disadvantages to the traveling public. Hence the variation application is **rejected**.

**Item No 27**

Heard.

1. The variation proposed is to shift the existing trip to Othai at 10.57 am to 10 pm. This shifting is found as inconvenient to the existing traveling public as the shifting proposed will result in the elimination of a service useful to the traveling public.
2. The field officer has reported that changing of timings of the existing trip from Manjeri to Areacode via Othayi will affect the traveling public.
3. The proposed variation will cause to increase the number of trips through notified portion from Manjeri to Nellipparamba of Vazhikkadavu – Kozhikkode notified route and is the violation of clause 19 of notification no 42/2009/TRAN dated 14.07.2009.

For the above reasons this authority found that the variation proposed is not satisfying the convenience of traveling public as laid down in proviso to sub section 3 (ii) of Section 80 of MV Act and is found more disadvantages to the traveling public. Hence the variation application is **rejected**.

**Item No 28**

Heard.

1. The existing route passes through notified portions. But the details of overlapping and increase in number of trips on the notified portion due to the proposed variations are not seen furnished. Hence Secretary is directed to conduct enquiry and furnish report on the above matters in view of the clause 19 of notification no. 42/2009/TRAN dated 14.07.2009.
2. The adverse affect of curtailment and benefits of extensions proposed are also not furnished specifically to weigh the advantages and disadvantages to the traveling public due to the proposed variation.

For the above reasons the decision on the application is **adjourned** for the compliance of above matters.

**Item No 29**

Heard. In view of the report of field officer it is found that the variation proposed is comparatively more advantageous than the disadvantageous. Hence variation of permit **granted** subject to the compliance of order no D3/875/STA/2005 dated 08/11/2011 of STA and settlement of timings.

**Item No 30**

Heard.

1. The proposed variation will cause to increase the number of trips through notified portion from Kondotty to Telephone Exchange of Vazhikkadavu – Kozhikkode notified route and is the violation of clause 19 of notification no 42/2009/TRAN dated 14.07.2009.
2. According to the proposed time schedule existing timings are unnecessarily shuffled and will cause in convenience to the passengers depending this service. The passengers and other operators on this route are used with the existing timings and time shuffling will create ill effects. Hence this authority is not satisfied that the variation will serve the convenience of public.

For the above reasons the application for variation of regular permit is **rejected**.

**Item No 31**

Heard. The proposed variation will cause to increase the number of trips through notified portion from Chankuvetti to Edarikkode of Kottayam – Kozhikkode notified route and is the violation of clause 19 of notification no 42/2009/TRAN dated 14.07.2009. Hence **rejected**.

### **Item No 32**

Heard. Variation of permit **granted** subject to the compliance of order no D3/875/STA/2005 dated 08/11/2011 of STA and settlement of timings.

### **Item No 33**

Heard.

1. The variation includes curtailment of route portion from Nilambur to Ramankuth there by avoiding the evening trip at 6.35 pm from Nilambur to Ramankuth and return which will adversely affect the existing traveling public of ill served remote area.
2. The advancing of night trip departure time at 8.09 pm to 6.40 pm from Nilambur will also adversely affect the existing traveling public to Pookottumpadam which is also an ill served remote area.

For the above reasons the variation proposed is not found satisfying the convenience of traveling public as laid down in proviso to sub section 3 (ii) of Section 80 of MV Act and is found more disadvantages to the traveling public. Hence the variation application is **rejected**.

### **Item No 34**

Heard. The variation application includes curtailment of the existing route portions Manjeri to Anakkottupuram and Wandoor to Emangad, also includes curtailment of one trip from Manjeri to Pandikkad. The curtailing portions of the existing route are ill served remote areas and existing traveling public will be heavily suffered due to the proposed route curtailments. The field officer in his report has also recommended not to grant this variation in view of the above said curtailment. In the above circumstances the variation proposed is not found satisfying the convenience of traveling public as laid down in proviso to sub section 3 (ii) of Section 80 of MV Act and is found more disadvantages to the traveling public. Hence the variation application is **rejected**.

### **Item No 35**

Heard. The variation application is to deviate the service through Hospital Road and Cherupara by curtailing the existing route portion from Chemmad to Cherumuck via Tirurangadi. Even though the field officer has reported that the variation will adversely affect the traveling public, he has not specified the reasons to reach on such a conclusion. Hence the decision on the application is **adjourned** with a direction to the Secretary to conduct a detailed enquiry regarding the effects of the proposed variation.

### **Item No 36**

Heard.

Considered the application for conversion of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger. This permit is renewed up to 18/05/2015 by this authority. Conversion of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger service will adversely affect the traveling public and students depending this service. It is also finds that -

- I. 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) Stops will be reduced, students depending this service on various portions of its route will be deprived of their concessional rate Traveling facility.
  - c) The daily commuters on various portions of this service will have to pay higher rate of fare without availing any additional facilities.
  - d) The variation proposed is not in compliance with the proviso to Section 80(3) (ii) of MV Act regarding the convenience of traveling public.
- II. As per clause 18 of draft notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012 the right to operate any class of service other than an ordinary service in the State of Kerala and to increase



trips shall be reserved exclusively with State Transport Undertaking. If the conversion of service as Fast Passenger Service is granted it will violate the above said notification.

For the above reasons the application for variation of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger is **rejected**.

### **Item No 37**

Heard.

Considered the application for conversion of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger. This permit is renewed up to 05/08/2015 by this authority. Conversion of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger service will adversely affect the traveling public and students depending this service. It is also finds that -

- I. 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) Stops will be reduced, students depending this service on various portions of its route will be deprived of their concessional rate Traveling facility.
  - c) The daily commuters on various portions of this service will have to pay higher rate of fare without availing any additional facilities.
  - d) The variation proposed is not in compliance with the provisions of Section 80(3) (ii) of MV Act regarding the convenience of traveling public.
- II. As per clause 18 of draft notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012 the right to operate any class of service other than an ordinary service in the State of Kerala and to increase trips shall be reserved exclusively with State Transport Undertaking. If the conversion of service as Fast Passenger Service is granted it will violate the above said notification.

For the above reasons the application for variation of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger is **rejected**.

### **Item No 38**

Heard.

1. Perused the judgment dated 27/06/2012 of Hon'ble STAT in MVARP No. 162/2012.
2. Perused the notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012. As per clause 18 of notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012 the right to operate any class of service other than an ordinary service in the State of Kerala and to increase trips shall be reserved exclusively with State Transport Undertaking. But the Hon'ble STAT ordered to grant the variation of regular permit in respect of S/C KL-45-D-4449 as Super Fast Service in its order dated 27/06/2012, prior to the above notification. Hence the variation of regular permit as Super Fast Service is **granted** subject to the compliance of Rule 260A of KMVR, the observations made by the Hon'ble STAT regarding the introduction of such a service by KSRTC in the above order and draft notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012.
3. The Secretary shall verify the existing time schedule and ensure its compliance with the order no. D3/875/STA/2005 dated 08/11/2011 of STA and settlement of timings if the existing timings are need to be changed.

### **Item No 39**

Heard.

1. Perused the judgment dated 02/05/2012 of Hon'ble High Court in wp©.10545/2012.
2. Perused the judgment dated 20/07/2012 of Hon'ble STAT in MVARP No. 211/2012.
3. Perused the notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012. As per clause 18 of notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012 the right to operate any class of service other than an ordinary service in the State of Kerala and to increase trips shall be reserved exclusively with State Transport Undertaking. But the Hon'ble STAT ordered to grant the variation of regular permit in respect of S/C KL-08-AR-1516 as Fast Passenger Service in its

order dated 20/07/2012, prior to the above notification. Hence the variation of regular permit as Limited Stop Fast Passenger Service is **granted** subject to the compliance of Rule 260A of KMVR ,the observations made by the Hon'ble STAT regarding the introduction of such a service by KSRTC in the above order draft notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012.

4. The Secretary shall verify the existing time schedule and ensure its compliance with the order no. D3/875/STA/2005 dated 08/11/2011 of STA and settlement of timings if the existing timings are need to be changed.

#### **Item No 40**

Heard.

- 1.) Perused the judgment dated 20/06/2012 of Hon'ble High Court in wp©.10492/2012.
- 2.) Perused the judgment dated 03/07/2012 of Hon'ble STAT in MVARP No. 176/2012.
- 3.) Perused the notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012. As per clause 18 of notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012 the right to operate any class of service other than an ordinary service in the State of Kerala and to increase trips shall be reserved exclusively with State Transport Undertaking. But the Hon'ble STAT ordered to grant the variation of regular permit in respect of S/C KL-10-X-4074 as Fast Passenger Service in its order dated 03/07/2012, prior to the above notification. Hence the variation of regular permit as Limited Stop Fast Passenger Service is **granted** subject to the compliance of Rule 260A of KMVR , the observations made by the Hon'ble STAT regarding the introduction of such a service by KSRTC in the above order and draft notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012. 4) The Secretary shall verify the existing time schedule and ensure its compliance with the order no. D3/875/STA/2005 dated 08/11/2011 of STA and settlement of timings if the existing timings are need to be changed.

#### **Item No 41**

Heard.

Considered the application for conversion of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger. This permit is renewed up to 24/04/2011 by this authority. Conversion of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger service will adversely affect the traveling public and students depending this service. It is also found that -

- I. a) There is no valid regular permit in respect of S/C KL-54-A-1746.  
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) 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)(ii) of MV Act regarding the convenience of traveling public.
- II. As per clause 18 of draft notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012 the right to operate any class of service other than an ordinary service in the State of Kerala and to increase trips shall be reserved exclusively with State Transport Undertaking. If the conversion of service as Fast Passenger Service is granted it will violate the above said notification.

For the above reasons the application for variation of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger is **rejected**.

#### **Item No 42**

Heard.

Considered the application for conversion of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger. This permit is valid up to 18/05/2015 by this authority. Conversion of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger

service will adversely affect the traveling public and students depending this service. It is also found that -

- I. 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) Stops will be reduced, students depending this service on various portions of its route will be deprived of their concessional rate Traveling facility.
  - c) The daily commuters on various portions of this service will have to pay higher rate of fare without availing any additional facilities.
  - d) The variation proposed is not in compliance with the provisions of Section 80(3) (ii) of MV Act regarding the convenience of traveling public.
- II. As per clause 18 of notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012 the right to operate any class of service other than an ordinary service in the State of Kerala and to increase trips shall be reserved exclusively with State Transport Undertaking. If the conversion of service as Fast Passenger Service is granted it will violate the above said notification.

For the above reasons the application for variation of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger is **rejected**.

#### **Item No 43**

Heard.

1. Perused the judgment dated 22/06/2012 of Hon'ble STAT in MVARP No. 154/2012.
2. Perused the draft notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012. As per clause 18 of draft notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012 the right to operate any class of service other than an ordinary service in the State of Kerala and to increase trips shall be reserved exclusively with State Transport Undertaking. But the Hon'ble STAT ordered to grant the variation of regular permit in respect of S/C KL-09-V-7177 as Fast Passenger Service in its order dated 22/06/2012, prior to the above notification. Hence the variation of regular permit as Limited Stop Fast Passenger Service is **granted** subject to the compliance of Rule 260A of KMVR, the observations made by the Hon'ble STAT regarding the introduction of such a service by KSRTC in the above order and draft notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012.
3. The Secretary shall verify the existing time schedule and ensure its compliance with the order no. D3/875/STA/2005 dated 08/11/2011 of STA and settlement of timings if the existing timings are need to be changed.

#### **Item No 44**

Heard.

1. Perused the judgment of Hon'ble High Court in wpc 11116/2012
2. Considered the application for variation of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger without insisting concurrence from sister RTAs. The vehicle S/C KL-10-S-7713 covered by this permit has been sold and Clearance Certificate issued on 21/05/2012 without insisting surrender of permit valid up to 20/10/2014. But so far the permit holder has not offered a stage carriage to replace on this permit. The permit is now kept idle without providing service to the public and hence the permit is ineffective in result. It is also found that-
  - I. 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.
    - 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)(ii) of MV Act regarding the convenience of traveling public.

II. As per clause 18 of draft notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012 the right to operate any class of service other than an ordinary service in the State of Kerala and to increase trips shall be reserved exclusively with State Transport Undertaking. If the conversion of service as Fast Passenger Service is granted it will violate the above said notification.

For the above reasons the application for variation of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger is **rejected**.

#### **Item No 45**

Heard.

Considered the application for conversion of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger. This permit is renewed up to 08/02/2014 by this authority. Conversion of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger service will adversely affect the traveling public and students depending this service. It is also found that -

I. 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) Stops will be reduced, students depending this service on various portions of its route will be deprived of their concessional rate Traveling facility.

c) The daily commuters on various portions of this service will have to pay higher rate of fare without availing any additional facilities.

d) The variation proposed is not in compliance with the provisions of Section 80(3)(ii) of MV Act regarding the convenience of traveling public.

II. As per clause 18 of draft notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012 the right to operate any class of service other than an ordinary service in the State of Kerala and to increase trips shall be reserved exclusively with State Transport Undertaking. If the conversion of service as Fast Passenger Service is granted it will violate the above said notification.

For the above reasons the application for variation of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger is **rejected**.

#### **Item No 46**

Heard.

Considered the application for conversion of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger. This permit is renewed up to 29/03/2014 by this authority. Conversion of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger service will adversely affect the traveling public and students depending this service. It is also found that -

I. 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) Stops will be reduced, students depending this service on various portions of its route will be deprived of their concessional rate Traveling facility.

c) The daily commuters on various portions of this service will have to pay higher rate of fare without availing any additional facilities.

d) The variation proposed is not in compliance with the provisions of Section 80(3)(ii) of MV Act regarding the convenience of traveling public.

II. As per clause 18 of draft notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012 the right to operate any class of service other than an ordinary service in the State of Kerala and to increase trips shall be reserved exclusively with State Transport Undertaking. If the conversion of service as Fast Passenger Service is granted it will violate the above said notification.

For the above reasons the application for variation of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger is **rejected**.

**Item No. 47**

Heard.

The vehicle S/C KL-08-AP-1434 covered by this permit has been sold and Clearance Certificate issued on 11/06/2012 without insisting surrender of permit valid up to 09/03/2015. But so far the permit holder has not offered a stage carriage to replace on this permit. The permit is now kept idle without providing service to the public and hence the permit is ineffective in result. It is also found that-

- I. a) There is no valid regular permit in respect of S/C KL-08-AP-1434.
  - 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) 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.
- II. As per clause 18 of draft notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012 the right to operate any class of service other than an ordinary service in the State of Kerala and to increase trips shall be reserved exclusively with State Transport Undertaking. If the conversion of service as Fast Passenger Service is granted it will violate the above said notification.

For the above reasons the application for variation of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger is **rejected**.

**Item No 48**

Heard.

Considered the application for conversion of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger. This permit is renewed up to 02/01/2017 by this authority. Conversion of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger service will adversely affect the traveling public and students depending this service. It is also found that -

- I. 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) Stops will be reduced, students depending this service on various portions of its route will be deprived of their concessional rate Traveling facility.
  - c) The daily commuters on various portions of this service will have to pay higher rate of fare without availing any additional facilities.
  - d) The variation proposed is not in compliance with the provisions of Section 80(3) (ii) of MV Act regarding the convenience of traveling public.
- II. As per clause 18 of draft notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012 the right to operate any class of service other than an ordinary service in the State of Kerala and to increase trips shall be reserved exclusively with State Transport Undertaking. If the conversion of service as Fast Passenger Service is granted it will violate the above said notification.

For the above reasons the application for variation of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger is **rejected**.

**Item No. 49**

Heard.

1. Perused the order of Hon'ble STAT in MVAAP No. 122/2011 dtd 6.07.2012.
2. As per the above order the Hon'ble STAT set aside the decision in Item No. 31 of this RTA meeting held on 22.2.2011 and directed to reconsider the request for conversion of service as a

fresh on the basis three factors and enquiry result of those factors. The three factors mentioned were (1) How many stops will be reduced in case of the petitioner's request is allowed. (2) How many number of Educational Institutions are there on the route and what will be the possibility of students suffering on account of the variation (3) How many LSOS were introduced subsequent to the petitioners permit.

The enquiry officer reported that there is no reduction of stops due to variation. There are 14 educational institutions on the enroute and the existing traveling facility of students will be affected badly. It is also reported that no LSOS services are introduced newly.

This authority reconsidered the request for variation on the above grounds, the length of the route, the enroute areas through which the service is operated, the convenient of public and necessity of variation as per law, and existing notification in this regard, It is found that

- 1) The route length of the service is only 80 kms which is only 10 kms above the minimum route length required for a fast passenger service as per rule 2 (e) of KMV rules and there is no legal obstruction in continuing this service as LSOS as the route length is below 140 kms.
- 2) The report of field officer furnished after enquiry as ordered by Hon'ble STAT reveals that there are 14 educational institutions on the enroute and the students of these Education Institutions now depending this service will have to suffer due to the deprival of concessional traveling facility now availed by them.
- 3) It is also found that this service is operating through so many sub urban towns and the daily commutators and students between those towns are the main beneficiaries of this service and the conversion of this service as fast passenger service will not provide any benefit or additional facilities to those traveling public rather than forced to pay higher rate of fare.
- 4) A major portion of this route is overlapping on the notified routes and therefore there were no possibility of introduction of such a new ordinary service on this route and in future also so long as the notification GO (P) No. 42/2009/Tran dtd. 14.7.2009 is in existence.
- 5) The conversion of this service as fast passenger service will result as if the introduction of a new service which is against the above said notification.
- 6) The KSRTC also vehemently objected the variation of service as fast passenger service raising the contention that their similar services through the major portion of this route will be affected badly and also pointed out the restriction for issue of fast passenger services to private operators in the light of draft notification No. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012.
- 7) This authority is not satisfied that the variation proposed will serve the convenience of the public and hence the condition laid down under Sub Section 3(ii) of section 80 of MV Act is also not complied by this variation request, but it is in its violation. This position is upheld by the Division Bench of Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WA 1447/2011 dated 24/11/2011.
- 8) As per clause 18 of notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012 the right to operate any class of service other than an ordinary service in the State of Kerala and to increase trips shall be reserved exclusively with State Transport Undertaking. If the conversion of service as Fast Passenger Service is granted it will violate the above said notification.
- 9) The vehicle is also not complying the KMV rule 260 A.

For the above reasons the application for variation of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger is **rejected**.

### **Item No 50**

Heard.

- I. Perused the judgment dated 31/07/2012 of Hon'ble STAT in MVARP No. 129/2011.
- II. Considered the application for conversion of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger. This permit is renewed up to 21/11/2016 by this authority. Conversion of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger service will adversely affect the traveling public and students depending this service. It is also finds that -
  - 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) Stops will be reduced, students depending this service on various portions of its route will be deprived of their concessional rate Traveling facility.
  - c) The daily commuters on various portions of this service will have to pay higher rate of fare without availing any additional facilities.
  - d) This authority is not satisfied that the variation proposed will serve the convenience of the traveling public as provided under sub section (3) (ii) of Section 80 of M V Act. This position is upheld by the Division Bench of Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WA 1447/2011 dated 24/11/2011.
- III. As per clause 18 of notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012 the right to operate any class of service other than an ordinary service in the State of Kerala and to increase trips shall be reserved exclusively with State Transport Undertaking. If the conversion of service as Fast Passenger Service is granted it will violate the above said notification.

For the above reasons the application for variation of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger is **rejected**.

### **Item No 51**

Heard.

1. Perused the judgment dated 08/12/2011 of Hon'ble STAT in MVARP No. 311/2011.
2. Perused the notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012. As per clause 18 of draft notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012 the right to operate any class of service other than an ordinary service in the State of Kerala and to increase trips shall be reserved exclusively with State Transport Undertaking. But the Hon'ble STAT ordered to grant the variation of regular permit in respect of S/C KL-55-F-4255 as Fast Passenger Service in its order dated 08/12/2011, prior to the above notification. Hence the variation of regular permit as Limited Stop Fast Passenger Service is **granted** subject to the compliance of Rule 260A of KMVR subject to the conditions of draft notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012.
3. The Secretary shall verify the existing time schedule and ensure its compliance with the order no. D3/875/STA/2005 dated 08/11/2011 of STA and settlement of timings if the existing timings are need to be changed.

### **Item No 52**

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

### **Item No 53**

The application for transfer of permit reconsidered and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

### **Item No 54**

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

### **Item No 55**

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

**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**

The application for transfer of permit reconsidered and transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

**Item No 76**

Heard. Change of address allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

**Item No 77**

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

**Item No 78**

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

**Item No 79**

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

**Item No 80**

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

**Item No 81**

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

**Item No 82**

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

**Item No 83**

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

**Item No 84**

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

**Item No 85**

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

**Item No 86**

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

**Item No 87**

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

**Item No 88**

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

**Item No 89**

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

**Item No 90**

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

**Item No 91**

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

**Item No 92**

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

**Item No 93**

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

**Item No 94**

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

**Item No 95**

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

**Item No 96**

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

**Item No 97**

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

**Item No 98**

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

**Item No 99**

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

**Item No 100**

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

**Item No 101**

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

**Item No 102**

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. Transfer of permit in favor of Sri. Abdul Sukkoor V P, S/o Mohammed Kutty, Vattaparamban House, Valamkulam, Thennala PO, Malappuram is allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

**Item No 116**

Heard. Transfer of permit in favor of Sri. Abdul Sukkoor V P, S/o Mohammed Kutty, Vattaparamban House, Valamkulam, Thennala PO, Malappuram is allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

**Item No 117**

Heard. Transfer of permit in favor of Smt. Ayisha, W/o Abdul Azeez, Areekatt House, Payyanad PO, Cholakkal, Manjeri, Malappuram is allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

**Item No 118**

Heard. Transfer of permit in favor of Smt. Ayisha, W/o Abdul Azeez, Areekatt House, Payyanad PO, Cholakkal, Manjeri, Malappuram is allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

**Item No 119**

Heard. Transfer of permit in favor of Sri. Mohammed Musthafa, S/o Ahammed kutty(late), Pathiriyal, Thiruvalli PO, Malappuram is allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

**Item No 120**

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

**Item No 121**

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

**Item No 122**

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

**Item No 123**

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

**Item No 124**

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

**Item No 125**

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

**Item No 126**

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

**Item No 127**

Heard. This is a permit issued to conduct service as fast passenger on the route Thrissur-Kannur and is valid up to 08/11/2012 and was issued before the date of notification No.5651/B2/2009/ Tran dated 02/08/2012. s per clause 3 of the draft notification No. 5651/B2/2009/Tran dated 02/08/2012, the permits issued prior to this notification will be permitted to continue till the dates of expiry of the respective permit. Hence this permit is not renewable. In the above circumstances there is no need of seeking concurrence from sister R.T.A

**Item No 128**

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

**Item No 129**

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

**Item No 130**

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

**Item No 131**

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

**Item No 132**

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

**Item No 133**

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

**Item No 134**

Secretary is allowed to seek concurrence from Sister RTAs, Kozhikkode & Thrissur.

**Item No 135**

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

**Item No 136**

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

**Item No 137**

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

**Item No 138**

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

**Item No 139**

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

**Item No 140**

Heard. As per order no G.O.(P) No.67/2011/Tran dated 30/11/2011 the government has decided not to issue stage carriage permit to vehicles having four wheels. The vehicle S/C KL-10-N-6056 covered by this permit is having only 4 wheels and the grant of renewal of this permit is against the above said order. The permit holder has not produced a vehicle complying the above said

government order to operate service. Hence the renewal application in respect of S/C KL-10-N-6056 is **rejected**.

**Item No 141**

Heard.

1. Perused the order of Hon'ble High Court in wpc13904/2012
2. In view of the pendency of wpc 13904/2012(K) the decision on the application for renewal of permit is **adjourned**.
3. Secretary is directed to follow up the pending case and report its disposal in the next meeting.

**Item No 142**

Heard.

1. Perused the order of Hon'ble High Court in wpc13904/2012
2. In view of the pendency of wpc 13904/2012(K) the decision on the application for renewal of permit is **adjourned**.
3. Secretary is directed to follow up the pending case and report its disposal in the next meeting.

**Item No 143**

Heard. Maximum time of four months for production of current records for availing the regular permit **granted** from 30/05/2012.

**Item No 144**

Heard. Maximum time of four months for production of current records for availing the regular permit **granted** from 30/05/2012.

**Item No 145**

Heard.

1. Perused the judgment dated 05/06/2012 of Hon'ble High Court in wpc 6845/2012.
2. In obedience to the judgment of Hon'ble High Court considered the request of the applicant dated 12/03/2012 by which the applicant requested to endorse the permit granted on 24/06/2010 in item no.12 of this authority. The grant of permit was communicated to the grantee on 08/07/2010. As per rule 159(2) of KMVR the grantee shall produce the current records of the vehicle along with registration certificate before the expiry of 4 months. In this case the applicant failed to produce the current records and registration certificate of the vehicle even after the expiry of 4 months. It is also noticed that the registration certificate is produced after 19 months from the date of communication of decision granting the permit and is actually transferred to him only on 09/03/2012, which shows that the applicant could not had a stage carriage in his name to produce for obtaining the permit till the expiry of 19 months. In the above circumstance the grant of regular permit is **revoked**.
3. Secretary is directed to place the regular permit application if any filed by the applicant, complying the normal procedure in the next meeting.

**Item No 146**

Heard. On perusal of records the variation of permit was granted earlier on 23/09/2006 and timings were settled on 05/01/2010. Now the request for revocation of variation is seen filed stating the difficulty of operating the existing stage carriage on the varied route portion. This variation was granted on the basis of necessity of traveling public of the proposed variation portion. Hence the veracity of the request to revoke the grant of variation of permit in this stage is need to be verified. Secretary is directed to conduct an enquiry regarding the matter and furnish the report in the next RTA.

**Item No 147**

Heard. **Adjourned** with direction to Secretary to seek opinion from Advocate General, Ernakulam regarding the feasibility of allowing the request of the DTO, KSRTC.

**Item No 148**

Applicant absent, **adjourned**.

**Item No 149**

Applicant absent, **adjourned**.

**Item No 150**

Heard. In view of the request of President, Privet Bus Owners Association, Valanchery and report of field officer, the Secretary is directed to issue notice under rule 207 of KMVR to revoke the approval granted by this authority for the functioning of the bus stand owned by the Valanchery Grama Panchayath and to give an opportunity to be heard. The result of hearing shall be placed before next Regional Transport Authority for taking further action in this regard. For the compliance of the above the decision on the request is **adjourned**.

**Item No 151**

Applicant absent, **adjourned**.

**Item No 152**

Applicant absent, **adjourned**.

**Item No 153**

Applicant absent, **adjourned**.

**Item No 154**

Applicant absent, **adjourned**.

**Item No 155**

Secretary is allowed to seek concurrence from Sister RTAs, Kozhikkode & Thrissur.

**Item No 156**

Heard. This is a request for specifying some of the stops on the route Mundumuzhi – Kozhikkode operating by the S/C KL-10-AB-5458 covered by regular permit valid up to 08/06/2014. On perusal of records now this vehicle is operating as Limited Stop Ordinary Service(LSOS) itself. The applicant has not furnished any reason or criteria for specifying particular stops and limiting the no of stops as 25 on this route. The report of field officer is also lacking such details. In this circumstances Secretary is directed to conduct a detailed enquiry regarding-

1. Necessity of fixing number of existing LSOS stops as specified in the request.
2. Whether all fare stages on the route are included as stops.
3. Whether any existing stops near to Educational institutions are omitted in the proposed list.
4. What are the existing LSOS stops on the route.

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

**Item No 157**

Applicant absent, **adjourned**.

**Item No 158**

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

**Item No 159**

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

**Item No 160**

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

**Item No.161**

Heard. Perused the report of local authority. The restriction in granting A/R permits in Tirur municipality was imposed in view of traffic congestions and lack of space for safe parking. The report of local authority in this regard is not specific and the PWD or traffic regulatory committee or Police department are not seen consulted with this matter. Hence this authority thinks that it is necessary to locate specific parking spaces with the number of A/Rs those can be safely parked without causing obstruction to the normal traffic and avoiding on road parking. Secretary RTA is directed to constitute a committee for this purpose with Municipal Secretary as its chairman and members from PWD, Police and MV department. The committee will verify the feasibility of providing parking places for A/Rs at suitable locations which will not affect the road safety and traffic flow and furnish a list of such suitable places to this authority. For the compliance of the above matters the application for variation of permit is **adjourned**.

**Item No.162**

Heard. Perused the report of local authority. The restriction in granting A/R permits in Tirur municipality was imposed in view of traffic congestions and lack of pace for safe parking. The report of local authority in this regard is not specific and the PWD as traffic regulatory committee or Police department are not seen consulted with this matter. Hence this authority thinks that it is necessary to locate specific parking spaces with the number of A/Rs those can be safely parked without causing obstruction to the normal traffic and avoiding tar road parking. Secretary RTA is directed to constitute a committee for this purpose with Municipal Secretary as its chairman and members from PWD, Police and MV department. The committee will verify the feasibility of providing parking places at suitable locations which will not affect the road safety and traffic flow and furnish a list of such suitable places. For the compliance of the above matters the application for variation of permit is **adjourned**.

**Item No.163**

Heard.

1. Perused the judgment of Hon'ble STAT dated 09/07/2012 in MVARP No.188/2012
2. In obedience to the order of Hon'ble STAT the variation of permit in respect of A/R KL-10-AD-7288 is **granted**.

**Item No.164**

Applicant absent, **adjourned**.

**Item No.165**

Heard. Perused the report of local authority. The restriction in granting A/R permits in Tirur municipality was imposed in view of traffic congestions and lack of space for safe parking. The report of local authority in this regard is not specific and the PWD or traffic regulatory committee or Police department are not seen consulted with this matter. Hence this authority thinks that it is necessary to locate specific parking spaces with the number of A/Rs those can be safely parked without causing obstruction to the normal traffic and avoiding on road parking. Secretary RTA is directed to constitute a committee for this purpose with Municipal Secretary as its chairman and members from PWD, Police and MV department. The committee will verify the feasibility of providing parking places for A/Rs at suitable locations which will not affect the road safety and traffic flow and furnish a list of such suitable places to this authority. For the compliance of the above matters the application for variation of permit is **adjourned**.

**Item No.166**

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Irumbuzhi to Malappuram Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10- AK-7332. 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. The applicant has not informed that this autorikshaw is 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.167**

Heard. Perused the report of local authority. The restriction in granting A/R permits in Tirur municipality was imposed in view of traffic congestions and lack of pace for safe parking. The report of local authority in this regard is not specific and the PWD as traffic regulatory committee or Police department are being seen consulted in this matter. Hence this authority thinks that it is necessary to locate specific parking spaces with the number of A/Rs those can be safely parked without causing obstruction to the normal traffic and avoiding tar road parking. Secretary RTA is directed to constitute a committee for this purpose with Municipal Secretary as its chairman and members from PWD, Police and MV department. The committee will verify the feasibility of providing parking places at suitable locations which will not affect the road safety and traffic flow and furnish a list of such suitable places. For the compliance of the above matters the application for variation of permit is **adjourned**.

**Item No.168**

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Vadakkemanna to Malappuram Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10- AL-3107. 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. 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.169**

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Chemmankadavu to Malappuram Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10- AA-3665. 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.170**

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Koottilangadi to Malappuram Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10- AH-3036. 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.171**

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Chemmankadavu to Malappuram Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-53-9652. 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. 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.172**

Heard. The report sought for vide item no.143 dtd.23-4-2012 of this authority from Malappuram Municipality regarding the availability of Parking area for Autorikshaws is not seen received. Hence the decision on the application is **adjourned**.

**Item No.173**

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Kolathur to Kondotty in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10- AH-9681. As per the decision of RTA dated 21/10/2004 issue of Autorikshaw permits in the municipalities and Kondotty town 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 Kondotty town and also whether the applicant is a permanent resident of Kondotty Panchayath. Hence **adjourned**.

**Item No.174**

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Irumbuzhi to Malappuram Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10- AJ-9757. 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.175**

Heard.

1. Perused the judgment of Hon'ble STAT dated 31/07/2012 in MVARP No.243/2012
2. In obedience to the order of Hon'ble STAT the variation of permit in respect of A/R KL-10-S-9710 is **granted**.

**Item No.176**

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Koottilangadi to Malappuram Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10- AK-9601. 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.177**

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Angadippuram to Perintalmanna Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-53-C-4054. 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. The secretary is directed to seek the availability of parking area for Autorikshaws in Perintalmanna municipality and also whether the applicant is a permanent resident of Perintalmanna municipality. Hence **adjourned**.

**Item No.178**

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Karathode to Malappuram Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10-AF-4890. 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.. 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.179**

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Koottilangadi to Malappuram Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10- Q-4360. 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. 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.180**

Heard.

1. Perused the judgment of Hon'ble STAT dated 31/07/2012 in MVARP No.244/2012
2. In obedience to the order of Hon'ble STAT the variation of permit in respect of A/R KL-10-AH-8708 is **granted**.

**Item No.181**

Heard. This is an application for fresh Autorikshaw permit with parking place at Manjeri Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10- AK-1625. 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. The applicant has not informed that this Autorikshaw is 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.182**

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Irumbuzhi to Malappuram Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10- AD-3645. 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.183**

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Chattiparamba to Malappuram Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10- AB-5615. 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. The applicant has not informed that this Autorikshaw is 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.184**

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Vengara to Malappuram Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10- AJ-5240. 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. The applicant has not informed that this Autorikshaw is 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.185**

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Vadakkemanna to Malappuram Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10- AJ-5657. 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. The applicant has not informed that this Autorikshaw is 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.186**

Heard.

1. The applicant has not furnished the reason for change of halting place from Kottukara to Nediyrrippu Colony Road. Applicant is directed to furnish specific reason for the change of Halting Place.

2. The Secretary is directed to conduct an enquiry through field officer regarding the feasibility and necessity of variation and also whether the proposed halting place is within the Kondotty town.

For the compliance of above matters the decision on the application is **adjourned**.

**Item No.187**

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Vadakkemanna to Malappuram Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10- AK-2514. 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.188**

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Koottilangadi to Malappuram Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10-AD-2095. 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.189**

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Kodur to Malappuram Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-53-B-2143. 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. 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.190**

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Irumbuzhi to Malappuram Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10-AJ-345. 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. The applicant has not informed that this Autorikshaw is 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.191**

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Koottilangadi to Malappuram Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10-AK-761. 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. The applicant has not informed that this Autorikshaw is 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.192**

Heard. The report sought for from Manjeri Municipality regarding the availability of Parking area for Autorikshaws is not seen received. The applicant has not informed that this Autorikshaw is purchased under any self employment scheme to get any exemption incorporated in the above decision. Hence the decision on the application is **adjourned**.

**Item No.193**

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Anakkaym to Manjeri Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10-Y-7457. 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. The applicant has not informed that this Autorikshaw is 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.194**

Perused the judgment dated 30/05/2012 of Hon'ble High Court in WA No.810 of 2010 in wpc 25718/2011. Secretary is directed to take necessary action to comply the direction.

**Item No.195**

Heard. This is a request to restrict the issue of Autorikshaw permits in Wandoor area. This area is with in Wandoor Grama Panchayath. At present there is no law in force to restrict the issue of Autorikshaw permits in Panchayath area. The report is not specifying any particular Autorikshaw stand as over saturated and is lacking space for Autorikshaw parking safely. In the absence of such a report this authority cannot interfere in this matter and to grant any relief as requested. Even though, the Secretary Wandoor Grama Panchayath in consultation with other concerned department is free to furnish the details of any over saturated Autorikshaw parking places for the consideration of this authority and the request is disposed of as above.

**Item No.196**

Heard. Perused the letter from Secretary, Tirur Municipality. The implementation of letter from Secretary, Tirur Municipality is kept in abeyance till the receipt of report from the committee directed to constitute vide item no 161 of this meeting for the verification and report regarding the suitability and safety of parking places for Autorikshaws furnished by the Secretary of Municipality. For the compliance of above matters the decision on the request is **adjourned**.

**Item No.197**

**Granted** concurrence for renewal of regular permit 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.198**

**Granted** concurrence for renewal of regular permit 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.199**

**Granted** concurrence for renewal of regular permit subject to draft notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012 and 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.200**

**Granted** concurrence for renewal of regular permit 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.201**

**Granted** concurrence for renewal of regular permit 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.202**

**Granted** concurrence for renewal of regular permit 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.203**

**Granted** concurrence for renewal of regular permit 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.204**

**Granted** concurrence for renewal of regular permit 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.205**

**Granted** concurrence for renewal of regular permit 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.206**

**Granted** concurrence for renewal of regular permit 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.207**

**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 draft notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012 and 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.208**

**Granted** concurrence for renewal of regular permit 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.209**

**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.210**

**Granted** concurrence for renewal of regular permit 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.211**

**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 draft notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012 and 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.212**

**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.213**

**Granted** concurrence for renewal of regular permit subject to draft notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012 and 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.214**

**Granted** concurrence for renewal of regular permit 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.215**

**Granted** concurrence for renewal of regular permit 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.216**

**Granted** concurrence for renewal of regular permit 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.217**

**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 draft notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012 and 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.218**

**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 draft notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012 and 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.219**

**Granted** concurrence for renewal of regular permit subject to draft notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012 and 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.220**

**Granted** concurrence for renewal of regular permit subject to draft notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012 and 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.221**

**Granted** concurrence for renewal of regular permit 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.222**

**Granted** concurrence for renewal of regular permit 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.223**

**Granted** concurrence for renewal of regular permit 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.224**

**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 draft notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012 and 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.225**

**Granted** concurrence for renewal of regular permit 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.226**

**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 draft notification no. 5651/B2/2009/TRAN dated 02/08/2012 and 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**

1. Perused the letter of Transport Commissioner, Thiruvananthapuram dated 02/07/2012.
2. In view of the letter from Transport Commissioner, Thiruvananthapuram dated 02/07/2012 and letter from Joint Secretary, Chief Ministers Public Grievance Redressal Cell, Thiruvananthapuram considered the imposing of time restriction for the operation of Tipper Lorries in Malappuram District, under the provisions of Section 115 of MV Act. This Authority is satisfied that it is necessary in the interest of safety of the public and students to impose restriction on the operation of Tipper Lorries from 8.30am to 10 am and from 3.30 pm to 5 pm in all roads and public places in Malappuram District. This decision will come in to force after 30 days from the date of notification.
3. Secretary shall take necessary step to notify the decision.

**No: 2**

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

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