

Decision of RTA, Malappuram dated 14/12/2011

Item No 1

Heard.

1. Applicant not offered any vehicle.
2. The applicant has not furnished the mandatory details as per the application form prescribed under rule 143(a) of KMVR 1989 such as seating capacity, maximum laden weight, wheel base, number of wheels.
3. As per the time schedule proposed most of the trips are provided as cut trips. The applicant is directed to modify time schedule providing full round trips between termini.
4. Secretary is directed to fix running time according to the order no. D3/875/STA/2011 of STA and direct the applicant to furnish time schedule as per the running time so fixed.

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

Item No 2

Heard. The distance of overlapping furnished by the Secretary is not seen taken by actually measuring the vehicle traversing distance on the notified routes. Hence in view of the objection raised by KSRTC, Secretary is directed to take actual measurement of overlapping distance and place before ensuing RTA. The application is adjourned for the compliance of above.

Item No 3

Absent. Adjourned.

Item No 4

Heard.

1. The objectors alleged that the proposed route overlaps for more than 5 km on the notified routes. Hence Secretary is directed to ascertain the exact total distance of overlapping.
2. The route proposed and time schedule are not specific and the trips are provided irregularly with various cut trips. The applicant is directed to modify the time schedule enabling smooth operation of the service.
3. Secretary is directed to fix running time according to the order no. D3/875/STA/2011 of STA and direct the applicant to furnish time schedule as per the running time so fixed.

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

Item No 5

Heard.

1. 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.
2. Secretary is directed to fix running time according to the order no. D3/875/STA/2011 of STA and direct the applicant to furnish time schedule as per the running time so fixed.

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

Item No 6

Heard. The applicant offered six wheeled S/C KL-55-A-465 and regular permit granted subject to the fixation of running time as per order no. D3/875/STA/2011 of STA and settlement of timings and verification of genuineness of vehicle offered.

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

Item No 7

Heard. The applicant offered six wheeled S/C KL 10 AH 7803 and regular permit granted subject to the fixation of running time as per order no. D3/875/STA/2011 of STA and settlement of timings and verification of genuineness of vehicle offered.

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

Item No 8

Heard.

1. Applicant not offered any vehicle.
2. The applicant has not furnished the mandatory details as per the application form prescribed under rule 143(a) of KMVR 1989 such as seating capacity, maximum laden weight, wheel base, number of wheels.
3. Secretary is directed to fix running time according to the order no. D3/875/STA/2011 of STA and direct the applicant to furnish time schedule as per the running time so fixed.

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

Item No 9

Heard. The applicant offered six wheeled S/C KL-07-AH-9890 and regular permit granted subject to the fixation of running time as per order no. D3/875/STA/2011 of STA and settlement of timings and verification of genuineness of vehicle offered.

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

Item No 10

Heard. The applicant offered six wheeled S/C KL-10-N-4449 and regular permit granted subject to the fixation of running time as per order no. D3/875/STA/2011 of STA and settlement of timings and verification of genuineness of vehicle offered.

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

Item No 11

Heard.

1. Applicant not offered any vehicle.
2. The applicant has not furnished the mandatory details as per the application form prescribed under rule 143(a) of KMVR 1989 such as seating capacity, maximum laden weight, wheel base, number of wheels.

3. The objectors contended that there is no sufficient space to turn the vehicle at one of the termini Vazhayur. Secretary is directed to conduct enquiry on this matter and furnish report.
4. Secretary is directed to fix running time according to the order no. D3/875/STA/2011 of STA and direct the applicant to furnish time schedule as per the running time so fixed.

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

Item No 12

Heard.

1. As per the time schedule only one trip each to the termini Kadampuzha and Vengara through the ill served sector is seen provided. That itself seems as to increase the route length so as to overcome the condition is clause 5(c) of notification No. 42/2009/TRAN dated 14/07/2009. Hence if other wise, the applicant is directed to modify the time schedule providing more trips to the above termini.
2. Secretary is directed to fix running time according to the order no. D3/875/STA/2011 of STA and direct the applicant to furnish time schedule as per the running time so fixed.
3. As the operating time is more than 17 hours the applicant is directed to file affidavit regarding the engaging of more than one crew for the operation of service without violation of existing laws in force in this regard.
4. In view of the objection of KSRTC regarding the distance of overlapping Secretary is directed to ascertain the exact length of overlapping.

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

Item No 13

Heard.

1. The KSRTC arose objection regarding the distance of overlapping stating that there is 4 km overlapping on the notified route and is more than 5% of route length. Hence Secretary is directed to ascertain exact length of overlapping on the notified route and the existence of vacant timings as claimed by the applicant.
2. Secretary is directed to fix running time according to the order no. D3/875/STA/2011 of STA and direct the applicant to furnish time schedule as per the running time so fixed.
3. As the operating time is more than 17 hours the applicant is directed to file affidavit regarding the engaging of more than one crew for the operation of service without violation of existing laws in force in this regard.

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

Item No 14

Heard. The applicant offered six wheeled S/C KL-10-P-115 and regular permit granted subject to the fixation of running time as per order no. D3/875/STA/2011 of STA and settlement of timings and verification of genuineness of vehicle offered.

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

Item No 15

Heard.

1. Applicant not offered any vehicle.
2. The applicant has not furnished the mandatory details as per the application form prescribed under rule 143(a) of KMVR 1989 such as maximum laden weight, wheel base, number of wheels.
3. Secretary is directed to fix running time according to the order no. D3/875/STA/2011 of STA and direct the applicant to furnish time schedule as per the running time so fixed.

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

Item No 16

Heard.

1. Applicant not offered any vehicle.
2. The applicant has not furnished the mandatory details as per the application form prescribed under rule 143(a) of KMVR 1989 such as seating capacity, maximum laden weight, wheel base, number of wheels.
3. The time schedule proposed is not specifically showing the via through which the trips are proposed to operate. The route proposed is having various termini and are having various paths to those termini, the trips shall be furnished with specific mention of path with intermediate places.
4. Secretary is directed to fix running time according to the order no. D3/875/STA/2011 of STA and direct the applicant to furnish time schedule as per the running time so fixed.

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

Item No 17

Heard.

1. The objectors alleged that there is overlapping of 4km on the notified route and the route length furnished is more than the actual route length. Hence Secretary is directed to ascertain exact route length and distance of overlapping on the notified route.
2. As per the time schedule all trips except the last trip is seen provided between Wandoor and Manjeri with in a distance of 22 kms. The route length is shown as 77kms. Only the last one round trip is provided on the remaining route portion of 55kms. It is therefore convinced that the last trip alone provided is to overcome the clause 5(c) of the notification No. 42/2009/TRAN dated 14/07/2009. If otherwise the applicant is directed to modify the time schedule providing all trips through the entire route length.
3. Secretary is directed to fix running time according to the order no. D3/875/STA/2011 of STA and direct the applicant to furnish time schedule as per the running time so fixed.

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

Item No 18

Heard.

1. Applicant not offered any vehicle.
2. The applicant has not furnished the mandatory details as per the application form prescribed under rule 143(a) of KMVR 1989 such as seating capacity, maximum laden weight, wheel base, number of wheels.
3. Secretary is directed to fix running time according to the order no. D3/875/STA/2011 of STA and direct the applicant to furnish time schedule as per the running time so fixed.

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

Item No 19

Heard.

1. Applicant not offered any vehicle.
2. The applicant has not furnished the mandatory details as per the application form prescribed under rule 143(a) of KMVR 1989 such as seating capacity, maximum laden weight, wheel base, number of wheels.
3. Secretary is directed to fix running time according to the order no. D3/875/STA/2011 of STA and direct the applicant to furnish time schedule as per the running time so fixed.

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

Item No 20

Heard.

1. This is a multi termini route and the route length is 40.5 km. But majority of trips are seen providing between a distance of 10km only. Hence the applicant is directed to furnish modified time schedule providing more trips to other termini to make the time schedule a balanced one.
2. There is a virgin portion of 2.5 kms for which road fitness certificate is not received.
3. Secretary is directed to fix running time according to the order no. D3/875/STA/2011 of STA and direct the applicant to furnish time schedule as per the running time so fixed.

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

Item No 21

Heard. Granted.

Item No 22

Heard. Granted.

Item No 23

Heard. Granted.

Item No 24

Heard. Variation granted subject to settlement of timings and providing sufficient number of crew to operate service as per the laws in force.

Item No 25

Heard. Variation granted subject to settlement of timings and providing sufficient number of crews to operate service as per the laws on force.

Item No 26

Heard.

1. The variation application is filed by deceased permit holder. Transfer of permit is not effected so far and permit is now not valid. Concurrence is required for its renewal. Hence the variation application is adjourned for want of renewal of permit and fresh application for variation by the transferee.
2. Transfer of permit allowed subject to clearance of Government dues if any.
3. Secretary is allowed to seek concurrence from Sister RTA, Kozhikkode. Issue temporary permit U/S 871(d) for continuation of service in the name of transferee.

Item No 27

Heard. This permit was extended on request of the permit holder that the Chungathara – Koottapadi sector is an ill served area and parallel services are operating on that portion and requested to grant variation to provide service to the traveling public of that area and same was granted by this RTA. The traveling public of that area is availing the traveling facility provided by the above variation from the year 2001 onwards. The curtailment of trips to Koottapadi will adversely affect the traveling public of that area. Hence this authority in its meeting held on 28/07/2011 directed the applicant to modify the variation application avoiding the curtailment proposed between Chungathara and Koottapadi. But from the modified application and proposed time schedule it is found that majority of trips especially during peak hours are curtailed between Chungathara and Koottapadi. This authority found that this variation application is not serving the convenience of the traveling public. Hence this variation application is not satisfying the provision laid down under section 80(3) of Motor Vehicle Act and is rejected.

Item No 28

Heard. The proposed variation includes increase of number of trips through the notified route Kottayam – Kozhikkode vide notification no. 42 /2009/TRAN dated 14/07/2009 and as per clause 19 of this said notification the right to increase no of trips in the notified route and its portions is reserved for KSRTC only. Hence grant of this variation is against the above said notification and is rejected.

Item No 29

Heard. Variation granted subject to settlement of timings.

Item No 30

Heard. The proposed variation will adversely affect the existing traveling public at Pannipara area as the majority of trips are curtailed. The variation application will not serve the convenience of the public. Hence rejected.

Item No 31

Heard. As per the proposed variation the curtailing portion of the route is 12kms and the major portion of curtailing portion is in Palakkad Dist. Secretary is directed to call a feasibility report from RTA, Palakkad regarding the effect of proposed curtailment. Hence adjourned.

Item No 32

Heard. The proposed variation includes increase of number of trips on the notified portion and the existing trips and timings are unnecessarily shuffled for which no special circumstances have been arised. The KSRTC raised objection against proposed variation. The variation violates clause 19 of notification no. 42 /2009/TRAN dated 14/07/2009 and there is no circumstances necessitating variation under rule 145(6) of KMV Rule 1989. Hence rejected.

Item No 33

Heard. The proposed variation includes increase in number of trips on the notified route portion of Kottayam – Kozhikkode notified route vide notification no. 42/2009/TRAN dated 14/07/2009 and the existing trip between Vengara – Manjeri is curtailed. The curtailment of trip proposed is on the peak school time and will adversely affect the students and other passengers of that sector. Thus the variation application violates clause 19 of notification no. 42/2009/TRAN dated 14/07/2009 and is comparatively disadvantages. There is no change in circumstances necessitating the proposed variation. Hence rejected.

Item No 34

Heard. Variation of permit granted subject to settlement of timings and providing sufficient number of crews to operate service as per the laws on force.

Item No 35

Heard. The proposed variation is sought for curtailment of trip to Kadampuzha from Valanchery and from Valanchery to Perasannur, which are ill served places to which the applicant had earlier obtained permits as fresh and by way of variation as per the then existing need. The curtailment of trips to those places will adversely affect the passengers depending on this service as there is no change in circumstances necessitating variation as per rule 145(6) of KMV Rule 1989. Hence rejected.

Item No 36

Heard.

1. The proposed variation includes curtailment of trips on the entire route. This will adversely affect the existing traveling public.
2. The proposed variation distance in total comes to 37kms and is more than the permissible limit under section 80(3) of MV Act.
3. The variation proposed is not advantages and is not serving the convenience of the existing traveling public.

For the above reasons the variation application is rejected.

Item No 37

Heard. When the extension from intermediate point Vettathur to Melattur with return of the existing route is taken as a variation the distance of variation will be 14kms and other extensions comes to 11.4kms. Thus the total variation is exceeding the limit prescribed under section 80(3) of MV Act 1988. Hence the variation application is rejected.

Item No 38

Heard. Variation granted subject to settlement of timings.

Item No 39

Heard. As per the variation application most of the day time trips are curtailed and extension is sought for to Ottumpuram. The field officer has not reported the effect of curtailment of existing trip to Theyyala. Hence Secretary, RTA is directed to ascertain the effect of curtailment of trips to Theyyala. The variation application is adjourned for the compliance of above.

Item No 40

Heard. Variation granted subject to settlement of timings.

Item No 41

Heard.

1. The regular permit expired on 05/09/2011 and renewal of permit is pending for want of concurrence.
2. The field officer has reported that the curtailment of route portion from Manjeri to Kozhikkode will adversely affect the existing traveling public especially of the night time trip.
3. The proposed variation will increase the number of trips on the notified route portion of Kozhikkode – Vazhikkadavu notified route and is violation of clause 19 of notification no. 42/2009/TRAN dated 14/07/2009.

For the above reasons the variation application is rejected.

Item No 42

Heard. Variation granted without change in existing timings from 6.38 am departure from Guruvayur to 9.48 pm arrival at Thrissur and subject to settlement of timings for last trip.

Item No 43

Heard. The distance of proposed extension is 3kms and the extension portion overlaps on a distance of 300 meters on the notified route portion of the notified route Vazhikkadavu – Kozhikkode which is more than 5% of the distance of extension proposed and the grant of this variation is against the notification no. 42/2009/TRAN dated 14/07/2009. The application is adjourned with direction to modify the variation application avoiding the overlapping on notified route portion.

Item No 44

Heard.

1. The distance of proposed extension is 3kms and the extension portion overlaps on a distance of 300 meters on the notified route portion of the notified route Vazhikkadavu – Kozhikkode which is more than 5% of the distance of extension proposed and the grant of this variation is against the notification no. 42/2009/TRAN dated 14/07/2009.
2. The curtailment of the route portion Erumamunda to Kurumbalangode via Matha will adversely affect the existing traveling public.

For the above reasons the variation application is rejected.

Item No 45

Heard.

1. The variation application includes curtailment of route portion from Maravettom to Kottappuram. The filed officer has reported that the curtailment will adversely affect the existing traveling public of that area.
2. Most of the existing timings are unnecessarily shuffled and there is error in the proposed timings.
3. The proposed variation is comparatively disadvantages and will not serve the convenience of traveling public. No change in circumstance has arised as per rule 145(6) of KMV rule 1989 necessitating the variation.

For the above reasons the variation application is rejected.

Item No 46

Heard. The variation of service to extend the rout from Vazhikkadavu to Maruthankadavu is granted subject to settlement of timings.

The application for converting category of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger is rejected for the following reasons.

- a) The KSRTC vehemently objected the conversion of the service as Fast Passenger Service as the major portion of the route overlaps on the notified route and the conversion of the service will adversely affect their similar services on this sector.
- b) Even after variation the route length is below 140kms and can be operated as an ordinary service. The route length is not necessitating conversion of service for its existence.
- c) As per the notification No. 42/2009/TRAN dated 14.07.2009 the right to operate any new service is reserved exclusively to State Transport Undertaking only. If the conversion of service as Fast Passenger Service is granted it will result as introduction of a new service and will violate the above said notification.
- d) Stops will be reduced, students depending this service on various portions of its route will be deprived of their concessional rate Traveling facility.
- e) The daily commuters on various portions of this service will have to pay higher rate of fare without availing any additional facilities.

Item No 47

Heard. The deviation proposed overlaps on a distance of 1.5 km on the notified route portion of Vazhikkadavu – Kozhikkode notified route from Edakkara to Palad. The overlapping also exceeds 5% of the proposed deviation distance. As per clause 19 of notification no. 42/2009/TRAN dated 14/07/2009 the right to increase any new service and to increase the number of trips reserved to State Transport Undertaking only. The grant of this variation violates the above said notification. Hence rejected.

Item No 48

Heard. The variation proposed provides only two trips to Pookottumpadam at early morning and late night. As per the time schedule no trips are seen provided to

Pookottumpadam during any of the peak hours so as to provide traveling facility to the public including students. On the other hand most of the timings are shuffled unnecessarily which will create inconvenience to the existing traveling public and students. This permit was issued just before six months and no new circumstances have arisen since the permit was issued on this route. Hence the variation is not in compliance with KMV Rule 145(6).

The variation proposed is found as to get the timings shuffled within a short period of grant of this permit without any genuine reason.

The existing permit is having a route length of 71.6 kms only. Ordinary Service can be operated up to 140kms as per rule 2 (0a) of KMVR. A service having route length not less than 70 kms and not more than 160 kms is allowed to operate as Fast Passenger Service. This permit was obtained about six months back so as to meet the traveling need of the daily commuters and students on those sectors. Even after the proposed variation the route length is 84.1 kms. . The route length does not necessitate the conversion of service as Fast Passenger Service for its existence. This permit was issued on the basis of the then existed need of Traveling public including students. The conversion of service without any special circumstances will adversely affect the traveling public. The students will be deprived of their existing concessional rate of traveling facility and the daily commuters depending upon this service will have to pay more fare without availing any additional facilities. From the variation sought it is also clear that the indention of the applicant is to reduce the existing stop, running time and their by increasing speed which is detrimental to the public and a potential threat to the society, which cannot be allowed. Due to this conversion the permit holder alone is benefited. The KSRTC also objected the conversion of service as Fast Passenger stating that the converted service can only be considered as a new service and then it will violate the Notification No.42/2009/TRAN dated 14.07.2009. There are so many services operating as ordinary service and Limited Stop Ordinary Services having rout length between 70kms and 140kms in the state. If such services are converted as Fast Passenger Services the traveling public and students will be put in to hardship and unjustifiable economic losses for their daily traveling facilities.

For the above reasons this variation application is found as more disadvantages and is not serving the convenience of the traveling public and hence rejected.

Item No 49

Heard. Variation by extension from Tanur to Mangalam Town granted without change in existing timings and subject to settlement of timings on the extended portion.

Item No 50

Heard.

1. The proposed variation increases the number of trips on the notified route portion from Edarikkode to Changuvetty on a distance of 1.3 kms of the notified route Kozhikkode – Kottayam. As per clause 19 of notification no. 42/2009/TRAN dated 14/07/2009 the right to increase any new service and to increase the number of trips reserved to State Transport Undertaking only.
2. As a result of the proposed variation the existing late night trip from Kottakkal at 10 pm is advanced by 25 minutes, which will adversely affect the existing night travelers depending this service.

For the above reasons the variation application is rejected.

Item No 51

Heard. The time schedule proposed for variation is erroneous. A correct time schedule is necessary to verify the feasibility of variation proposed. Hence adjourned with direction to the applicant to furnish a modified time schedule tallying with the proposed variation.

Item No 52

Heard. Variation granted subject to settlement of timings.

Item No 53

Heard. Variation granted subject to settlement of timings.

Item No 54

Heard.

1. Perused the order of Hon'ble STAT in MVAA 326/2011 dated 25/10/2011.
2. In view of the field officer's report the variation granted subject to settlement of timings.

Item No 55

Heard.

1. The vehicle operated on this route has been sold and clearance certificate already issued and permit holder has not so far produced any vehicle to operate on this permit.
2. The details of overlapping on notified sectors of variation portion is not specifically furnished. Secretary is directed to ascertain the details of overlapping on the variation portion proposed so as to verify the compliance of notification no. 42/2009/TRAN dated 14/07/2009 and the provision of Section 80(3) of MV Act 1988.

Hence adjourned.

Item No 56

Heard.

1. Perused the judgment of Hon'ble STAT in MVARP No. 307/2011 dated 10/10/2011.
2. In obedience to the order of Hon'ble STAT the conversion of service as Fast Passenger Service is granted subject to remittance of fee for variation and compliance of rule 260(A) of KMV Rule 1989. Considering the safety aspect and present road infrastructure it is also decided not to reduce running time by increasing the speed at which the service is operating and there fore there is no change in rate of running time and number of stops.

Item No 57

Heard.

1. Perused the judgment of Hon'ble High Court in WPC No. 23754/2011 dated 04/10/2011.
2. In obedience to the order of the Hon'ble High Court in WPC No. 23754/2011 the request for conversion of service as Super Fast Service is considered without insisting concurrence of sister RTAs. This RTA has already renewed the permit and is valid up to 21/02/2015. Now the vehicle is operating as

Limited Stop Ordinary Service and the conversion of service as Super Fast Service will adversely affect the existing traveling public and students depending this service and hence rejected for the following reasons.

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

Item No 58

Heard.

1. Perused the judgment of Hon'ble High Court reported in 2000(3) KLT 610.
2. Considered the application for conversion of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger. This permit is renewed up to 22/08/2015 by this authority. Conversion of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger service will adversely affect the traveling public and students depending this service. Hence rejected for the following reasons.
 - a. The KSRTC vehemently objected the conversion of the service as Fast Passenger Service as the major portion of the route overlaps on the notified route and the conversion of the service will adversely affect their similar services on this sector.
 - b. As per the notification No. 42/2009/TRAN dated 14.07.2009 the right to operate any new service is reserved exclusively to State Transport Undertaking only. If the conversion of service as Fast Passenger Service is granted it will result as introduction of a new service and will violate the above said notification.
 - c. Stops will be reduced, students depending this service on various portions of its route will be deprived of their concessional rate Traveling facility.
 - d. The daily commuters on various portions of this service will have to pay higher rate of fare without availing any additional facilities.

Item No 59

Heard.

1. Perused the judgment of Hon'ble STAT in MVARP No. 52/2011 dated 26/08/2011.
2. In obedience to the order of Hon'ble STAT the conversion of service as Fast Passenger Service is granted subject to remittance of fee for variation and compliance of rule 260(A) of KMV Rule 1989. Considering the safety aspect

and present road infrastructure it is also decided not to reduce running time by increasing the speed at which the service is operating and therefore there is no change in rate of running time and number of stops.

Item No 60

Heard.

1. Perused the judgment of Hon'ble High Court reported in 2000(3) KLT 610.
2. Considered the application for conversion of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger. This permit is renewed up to 20/07/2015 by this authority. Conversion of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger service will adversely affect the traveling public and students depending this service. Hence rejected for the following reasons.
 - a) The KSRTC vehemently objected the conversion of the service as Fast Passenger Service as the major portion of the route overlaps on the notified route and the conversion of the service will adversely affect their similar services on this sector.
 - b) As per the notification No. 42/2009/TRAN dated 14.07.2009 the right to operate any new service is reserved exclusively to State Transport Undertaking only. If the conversion of service as Fast Passenger Service is granted it will result as introduction of a new service and will violate the above said notification.
 - c) Stops will be reduced, students depending this service on various portions of its route will be deprived of their concessional rate Traveling facility.
 - d) The daily commuters on various portions of this service will have to pay higher rate of fare without availing any additional facilities.

Item No 61

Heard.

1. Perused the judgment of Hon'ble High Court reported in 2000(3) KLT 610.
2. Considered the application for conversion of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger. This permit is renewed up to 28/04/2014 by this authority. Conversion of service as Limited Stop Fast Passenger service will adversely affect the traveling public and students depending this service. Hence rejected for the following reasons.
 - a) The KSRTC vehemently objected the conversion of the service as Fast Passenger Service as the major portion of the route overlaps on the notified route and the conversion of the service will adversely affect their similar services on this sector.
 - b) As per the notification No. 42/2009/TRAN dated 14.07.2009 the right to operate any new service is reserved exclusively to State Transport Undertaking only. If the conversion of service as Fast Passenger Service is granted it will result as introduction of a new service and will violate the above said notification.

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

Item No 62

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

Item No 63

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

Item No 64

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

Item No 65

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

Item No 66

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

Item No 67

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

Item No 68

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

Item No 69

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

Item No 70

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

Item No 71

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

Item No 72

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

Item No 73

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

Item No 74

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

Item No 75

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

Item No 76

Heard. Transfer of permit in favor of Smt. Badariyya, W/o Ashraf(Late) is allowed subject to clearance of Govt. dues if any.

Item No 77

Heard. Transfer of permit in favor of Smt. Mariamma, W/o (Late) Alavikutty is 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

1. There is no application for revocation of the earlier grant of transfer of permit vide item no 77 dated 22/02/2011. Secretary, RTA is directed to ascertain the genuineness of request if any filed by the permit holder. Hence there is no ground for revocation of the earlier grant and is adjourned for compliance of above matters.
2. The second application for transfer of permit between the permit holder and Sri. Keeri Abdul Majeed is adjourned for the compliance of above.

Item No 104

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

Item No 105

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

Item No 106

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

Item No 107

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

Item No 108

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

Item No 109

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

Item No 110

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

Item No 111

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

Item No 112

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

Item No 113

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

Item No 114

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

Item No 115

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

Item No 116

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

Item No 117

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

Item No 118

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

Item No 119

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

Item No 120

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

Item No 121

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

Item No 122

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

Item No 123

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

Item No 124

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

Item No 125

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

Item No 126

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

Item No 127

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

Item No 128

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

Item No 129

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

Item No 130

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

Item No 131

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

Item No 132

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

Item No 133

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

Item No 134

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

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, Kozhikkode.

Item No 138

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

Item No 139

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

Item No 140

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

Item No 141

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

Item No 142

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

Item No 143

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

Item No 144

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

Item No 145

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

Item No 146

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

Item No 147

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

Item No 148

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

Item No 149

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

Item No 150

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

Item No 151

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

Item No 152

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

Item No 153

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

Item No 154

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

Item No 155

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

Item No 156

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

Item No 157

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

Item No 158

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

Item No 159

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

Item No 160

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

Item No 161

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

Item No 162

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

Item No 163

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

Item No 164

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

Item No 165

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

Item No 166

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

Item No 167

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

Item No 168

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

Item No 169

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

Item No 170

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

Item No 171

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

Item No 172

Heard. The permit was valid up to 08/10/2011 and was issued prior to 09/05/2006. This authority is convinced that the applicant was prevented from filing application for renewal of permit in time due to good and sufficient reason. Hence the delay occurred in filing application for renewal is condoned.

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

Item No 173

Grantee of this permit on the route Pandikkad – Maruthangad – Perintalmanna is absent. The request filed by the grantee on 10/04/2011 for the grant of maximum time for production of current records is considered. The decision of RTA granting the permit was communicated on 18/03/2011. But the grantee has not produced current records within the maximum time allowable under rule 159 of KMV Rule 1989. Now 9 months elapsed from the date of communication. Hence the grant of regular permit vide decision in item no 8 dated 22/02/2011 is revoked under rule 159(2) of KMV Rule 1989.

Item No 174

The variation was granted on 24/01/2007 in item no 23. The grantee has not produced current records and not availed the granted variation even though the timings were settled on 04/04/2009. Hence the grant of variation is revoked.

Item No 175

Heard. The permit was granted on 28/07/2011 vide item no 4 and decision was communicated on 15/09/2011. The request for producing current records of the vehicle is found as genuine. Hence maximum time for production of current records and change of vehicle with identical one is allowed with the condition that the vehicle shall be a six wheeler and the seating capacity shall not be less than that of the earlier one offered.

Item No 176

Heard. This permit was granted on 28/07/2011 to operate an offered vehicle KL-11-M-4266 having wheel base 380cm and seating capacity 28 in all. The change of vehicle can be allowed only if the vehicle offered and vehicle produced for change are having identical features such as seating capacity, wheel base etc. In this case vehicle produced for change is having less wheel base and seating capacity. Hence the request for change of vehicle is rejected.

Item No 177

Heard. This is a fresh application for temporary permit under section 87(1)(c) of MV Act on the route Kozhikkode – Thrissur.

1. The field officer has not reported any temporary need of stage carriage service on this route and on the other hand it is reported that the existing services operated by KSRTC and other privet stage carriages with in a time gap of 2 to 3 minutes are sufficient to meet the need of Sabarimala pilgrims.

2. This route overlaps more than 5% of the route length on the notified route Kottayam – Kozhikkode and is against clause 5(c) of notification no. 42/2009/TRAN dtd 14.7.2009

For the above reasons the application for Temporary permit under section 87(1)(c) is rejected.

Item No 178

Heard. The renewal of this permit was granted vide decision no 81 dated 22/02/2011 by this RTA subject to the production of NOC from finance company and other current records of the vehicle except in respect of tax. The same was communicated on 29/03/2011. But the permit holder not availed the above grant of renewal complying the conditions there in. The renewal was granted with effect from 23/02/2005 for five years and at the time of grant of the above renewal there was no application with prescribed fee for the subsequent renewal which was already due.

This applicant has approached the Hon'ble High Court with a prayer to issue order to consider the renewal fee remitted for the period from 23/02/2005 to 22/02/2010 for the subsequent renewal also without insisting remittance of fee for subsequent renewal from 23/02/2010. But the Hon'ble Court dismissed the writ petition as the petitioner was continuously absent on the hearing dates. Now the applicant's request is the same. On the basis of the first application dated 23/02/2005 and fee remitted for the same the renewal was granted by RTA and hence the business of RTA is carried out on that application and fee. The applicant has necessarily to remit prescribed fee for each renewal along with statutory application for the renewal of permit. In this case the applicant has not complied the same.

Now 8 months has elapsed from the date of communication of decision of RTA granting renewal and maximum time allowable under rule 172(3) of KMV Rule 1989 is over. Hence the grant of renewal of permit is revoked and the request of the applicant to grant second renewal without fee and statutory application is rejected since it is not in accordance with law.

Item No 179

Adjourned. Secretary is directed to furnish the details of charge memos issued on the check reports and the response from the permit holder.

Item No 180

Heard. The proposed stop for Limited Stop Buses is situated 500 meters from Alinchuvadu Limited Stop Bus Stop and 400 meters from Koottumoochi Limited Stop Bus Stop. The proposed stop is within a distance of 900 meters and due to grant of this Bus Stop there will be 3 Limited Stop Bus stops with in a span of 900 meters which is not desirable as far as the increase in running time and subsequent possibility of over speeding is considered. It will also create inconvenience to the long distance passengers depending Limited Stop Ordinary services. For the above reasons the request for Bus Stop for Limited Stop services at Kodakkad is rejected.

Item No 181

Heard.

1. Perused the judgment of Hon'ble STAT in MVARP 276/2011
2. In obedience to the judgment the condition imposed in the permit that “ the vehicle not park or pick up passengers from with in the city” is lifted. Secretary is directed to issue necessary endorsement in this regard in the permit.

Item No 182

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Mangattupulam to Malappuram Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10-AH-8708. 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 fresh Autorikshaw permit in respect of Autorikshaw KL-55-G-7113 with Parking place at Tirur Municipality. As per the report of Joint RTO, Tirur this Autorikshaw was purchased with the financial aid of Kerala State Backward Classes Development Corporation, Malappuram unit under self employment scheme. Hence the applicant is eligible for exemption from the decision of RTA dated 21/10/2004 restricting Autorikshaw permit in municipalities. Hence fresh regular Autorikshaw permit granted with parking place at Tirur Municipality.

Item No 184

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Thalakkadathur to Tirur municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL 55 A 6651. As per the report of Joint RTO, Tirur this Autorikshaw was purchased with the financial aid of Kerala State Backward Classes Development Corporation, Malappuram unit under self employment scheme. Hence the applicant is eligible for exemption from the decision of RTA dated 21/10/2004 restricting Autorikshaw permit in municipalities. Hence regular variation of Autorikshaw permit granted with parking place at available parking area reported by Secretary, Tirur Municipality.

Item No 185

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from B P Angadi to Tirur municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL 10 U 3804. As per the report of Joint RTO, Tirur this Autorikshaw was purchased under PMRY scheme. Hence the applicant is eligible for exemption from the decision of RTA dated 21/10/2004 restricting Autorikshaw permit in municipalities. Hence regular variation of Autorikshaw permit granted with parking place at available parking area reported by Secretary, Tirur Municipality.

Item No 186

Heard.

1. Perused the order of Hon'ble High Court in WPC 22157/2011(T) dated 17/10/2011.
2. The Hon'ble Court in its judgment has directed to take a decision on the complaint regarding the Autorikshaw parking at Kakkanchery junction after hearing all the petitioners and respondents mentioned in the judgment. This authority thinks it fair and proper that the above mentioned parties shall be heard on the basis of the suggestion put forward by the Joint RTO, Tirurangadi who conducted the detailed enquiry and submitted the report. Hence the final decision on this matter is adjourned awaiting the result of hearing of the above mentioned parties. Secretary

is directed to convene a meeting and seek the acceptance of the suggestions of Joint RTO, Tirurangadi. Secretary shall place the matter in the ensuing RTA along with the minutes of the meeting mentioned above. Hence adjourned.

Item No 187

Heard. Perused the request of Wandoor Auto Coordination Committee and the decision of Wandoor Grama Panchayath. But there is no specific mention regarding the non availability of Parking space inside the Wandoor town area. Hence Secretary is directed to call for a specific report regarding the availability of Parking space for Autorikshaws in Wandoor town limit from the Secretary, Wandoor Grama Panchayath, adjourned.

Item No 188

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Thalakkadathur to Tirur municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL 55 B 3522. As per the report of Joint RTO, Tirur this Autorikshaw was purchased under PMRY scheme. Hence the applicant is eligible for exemption from the decision of RTA dated 21/10/2004 restricting Autorikshaw permit in municipalities. Hence regular variation of Autorikshaw permit granted with parking place at available parking area reported by Secretary, Tirur Municipality.

Item No 189

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Thalakkadathur to Tirur municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-55-3373. As per the report of Joint RTO, Tirur this Autorikshaw was purchased with the financial aid of Kerala State Backward Classes Development Corporation, Malappuram unit under self employment scheme. Hence the applicant is eligible for exemption from the decision of RTA dated 21/10/2004 restricting Autorikshaw permit in municipalities. Hence regular variation of Autorikshaw permit granted with parking place at available parking area reported by Secretary, Tirur Municipality.

Item No 190

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Thalakkadathur to Tirur municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL 55/A 9479. As per the report of Joint RTO, Tirur this Autorikshaw was purchased under the scheme of NMDFC 2007-2008 of Matsyafed. Hence the applicant is eligible for exemption from the decision of RTA dated 21/10/2004 restricting Autorikshaw permit in municipalities. Hence regular variation of Autorikshaw permit granted with parking place at available parking area reported by Secretary, Tirur Municipality.

Item No 191

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Mangattupulam to Malappuram Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10-S-9710. 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 192

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Haji Bazar to Tirur municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL 10/X 8507. As per the report of Joint RTO, Tirur this Autorikshaw was purchased with the financial aid of Kerala State Backward Classes Development Corporation, Malappuram unit under self employment scheme. Hence the applicant is eligible for exemption from the decision of RTA dated 21/10/2004 restricting Autorikshaw permit in municipalities. Hence regular variation of Autorikshaw permit granted with parking place at available parking area reported by Secretary, Tirur Municipality.

Item No 193

1 & 2 Heard. This is an application for parking place at Tirur Municipality area in respect of the A/R KL-55-G-8220. The applicant has purchased the Autorikshaw under self employment loan scheme of Kerala State Backward Classes Development Corporation and as per the resident certificate issued by Tirur Municipality the applicant is a resident in Tirur municipal area. Hence granted.

Item No 194

Heard. Considered the distance on the route Valanchery – Chenadankulamb and number of fare stages. It is found that the total distance of the above route is 10 kms and there are 5 stages on a distance of 10kms. It is also noticed that the distance between C K Para to Mukilpeedika is 1 km only. Hence it is found as an excess stage taking in to account of total distance, number of stages and distance between the stages. It is there for decided not to consider Mukilpeedika as a fare stage on the above route. As regard to Valanchery – Karekkad – Kadampuzha route, a detailed enquiry report is necessary and Secretary is directed to furnish the same in the next RTA.

Item No 195

Heard. This is a request for shifting fare stage from Cheenichuvadu to Peedikapadi. At present it is found that there is only 4 stages and is not found as excess and this RTA is not inclined for shifting of Fare Stages. Hence the application is not maintainable by this authority and is rejected.

Item No 196

Heard. This is a request for shifting fare stage from Pathanapuram to Therattammal, Moorkhanad Schoolpady to Chelakkode Millumpadi and Thachanna to Choolatti. At present it is found that there is only 5 stages and is not found as excess and this RTA is not inclined for shifting of Fare Stages. Hence the application is not maintainable by this authority and is rejected.

Item No 197

Absent. Adjourned.

Item No 198

Heard. Perused the report of field officer and the fare stages between Chemmad and V K Padi via Thalappara Junction are found in excess by one stage considering the total distance between Chemmad and V K Padi. The distance between Thalappara and Valiyaparamba is found as 0.9km and that between Alinchuvadu and Valiyaparamba is

found as 2.5 kms. Hence the representations in this regard is convinced as genuine and the fare stage at Thalappara junction between Alinchuvadu and Valiyaparamba is only 2.5 kms. It is there for decided to abolish the fare stage at Thalappara Junction and there by the number of fare stages between Chemmad and V K Padi is refixed as 3(Three).

Item No 199

Heard. Perused the report of field officer and the representations filed in this regard. On perusal of the above records it is found that the total distance on the route Tirur – Puthanathani is 12.3 kms and there are 6 fare stages on this route. Considering the route length and that the distance between the stages Kurungad and Randal is 1.3 km only. It is found that only 5 stages are required on this route. Hence it is decided to abolish fare stage at Kurungad and the total stages refixed as 5(Five) only on this route.

Item No 200

Heard. Perused the report of field officer and the representations from public regarding excess fare collected. On perusal of records it is found that the total distance on the route Valanchery to Pottikuzhi is 12.5 kms. and the existing stages are found as in accordance with the existing norms. No fare stages ahead of the places mentioned in the representations can be abolished or shifted. Hence the request for shifting and abolishing fare stages on this route is rejected.

Item No 201

Heard. Perused the report of field officer and the representation. The existing stages were fixed considering the norms existed and taking in to account of importance of places. At present this authority is not convinced so as to incline towards shifting of fare stages based the changing comparative measure of importance of the places. Hence the request of shifting the fare stage is rejected.

Item No 202

Heard. Perused the report of field officer and the representations in this regard. It is found that the total distance of route in question is 10.2 kms and at present there are 5 fare stages. It is also seen that the distance between Maramvettichal and Kittikkad is only 2.4 km and there is a fare stage named as Moothedam at a distance of 1.3km from Maramvettichal and 1.1 km from Kuttikkad, which is found as an excess stage on this route and is decided to abolish, re fixing the total stages as 4(Four) only.

Item No 203

Heard. Perused the report of field officer and the representations in this regard and letter from MLA, Ponnani L A. The total distance of the route in question is 16 kms and as per the existing fare stages there is a fare stage at a distance of 1.7km from Maathipadam to Naranipuzha bridge and distance between the fare stages Para and Puthanpalli is found as 0.3 kms. As per the field officers report and considering the fare stages fixed between very shorter distances it is decided to abolish two fare stages at Naranipuzha Bridge and Para and to re fix as one fare stage at Eramangalam. There by re fixed the number of fare stages as 6(Six) on the above route in question.

Item No 204

Heard. The representation of the petitioner is regarding the fare stage at Transformer Padi after the fare stage at Karutheni on the Wandoor – Kalikavu route. As per the report of the field officer it is not clear about the fare stage after Transformer Padi and its distances.

Hence this matter is adjourned with direction to furnish a specific report on the above matter.

Item No 205

Perused the suggestions of the committee constituted to examine the existing traffic system at Perintalmanna Town. The committee after a detailed study and conducted a meeting suggested that the existing traffic system can be rescheduled only after the completion of the Bye pass road from Manathumangalam Junction to Ponniakurussi. The said bye pass road is nearing to finishing stage and a traffic rearrangement to redress the bus operators grievances can be made effectively only after the opening of the said bye pass road. Any change in the existing system will result in heavy traffic block and in convenience to traveling public and recommended to continue the existing traffic system till the opening of the above said bye pass road. The above suggestion is convinced as more suitable as the frequent changes without sufficient road facility will create more inconvenience, uncertainty and resulting traffic congestions. Hence the above said suggestion is approved till the opening of bye pass road and the suggestions as a temporary measures listed below as serial number 1 to 9 is approved.

1. The Police aid post at Manazhi Memorial bus stand and Bye pass bus stand has to be make effective in order to ensure that the buses are entering those bus stand.
2. Joint RTO, Perintalmanna to take early steps for the implementation of decision RTA, imposing specific color to Autorikshaws having permits with parking place at Perintalmanna.
3. RDO, to take early steps to dispose by auction all the vehicles seized and kept near the Police Station.
4. To erect fencing on the foot path for the safety of Pedestrians
5. To take steps to stop the Buses from Kozhikkode side near Presentation School for stepping down of Passengers.
6. To enter all buses in Manazhi Bus stand from Palakkad side bound to Kozhikkode.
7. To take steps for the removal of transformer on Mannarkkad Road.
8. To erect sufficient traffic signal Boards and 'No Parking' boards by traffic Police.
9. To ensure that the buses are not turning at the unauthorized spots except Bus stands by the Police authorities.

Item No 206

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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 214

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 215

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 216

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 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 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 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 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 220

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 221

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 222

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 223

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 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 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 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 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 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 227

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 228

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 229

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 230

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 231

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 232

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 233

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 234

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 235

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 236

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 237

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 238

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 239

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 240

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 241

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 242

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 243

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 244

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 245

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 246

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 247

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 248

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 249

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 250

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 251

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 252

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 253

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

Departmental item

No: 1

Perused the letter of Deputy Transport Commissioner, Central Zone -1. The validity of substitute temporary permit in favor of stage carriages having same seating capacity that of regular permit vehicle can be allowed for the maximum period of 4 months in case of intra district permits and those having less seating capacity and model the validity of substitute temporary permit can be limited to 20 days for giving opportunity to those vehicle owners having vehicles with higher seating capacity and model to operate substitute service on the same route.

No: 2

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

Supplementary Item No: 1

Heard.

1. Applicant not offered any vehicle.
2. The applicant has not furnished the mandatory details as per the application form prescribed under rule 143(a) of KMVR 1989 such as seating capacity, maximum laden weight, wheel base etc.
3. Secretary is directed to fix running time according to the order no. D3/875/STA/2011 of STA and direct the applicant to furnish time schedule as per the running time so fixed.

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

Supplementary Item No: 2

Heard.

1. Applicant not offered any vehicle.
2. The applicant has not furnished the mandatory details as per the application form prescribed under rule 143(a) of KMVR 1989 such as seating capacity, maximum laden weight, wheel base etc.
3. Secretary is directed to fix running time according to the order no. D3/875/STA/2011 of STA and direct the applicant to furnish time schedule as per the running time so fixed.

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

Supplementary Item No: 3

Heard. Perused the judgment of Hon'ble STAT in MVAA No. 219/2010. The Hon'ble STAT has observed that no proper field enquiry has done on the application for variation. Hence it is necessary to conduct an enquiry regarding the feasibility of variation sought for with a detailed report on the effects of rearrangement of trips furnished in the application. The matter is considered there for as a fresh and Secretary is directed to conduct detailed enquiry on the above matters and place before next RTA. Hence adjourned.

Supplementary Item No: 4

Heard. Perused the judgment of Hon'ble STAT in MVAA no. 80/2011 dated 12/09/2011 and reconsidered the application for regular variation of permit in respect of S/C KL-11-S-557 (replaced by KL-09-Q-919) in view of the judgment of Hon'ble STAT. On perusal of the records it is found that RTA, Kozhikkode has taken a decision vide item no. 19 dated 15/07/2010 to allow 50% of the services to operate through the new road and the remaining 50% through Kalvery hills. The variation of permit of S/C KL-18-5018 pointed out by the applicant was granted on 22/07/2009 which is prior to the above decision. In this

case the field officer has reported that if the services are fully deviated through the proposed new by pass road the Kalvery hills area will get isolated and it will affect the traveling public of that area. Hence the variation sought for is against public interest and the decision of RTA, Kozhikkode. This authority is not informed about the details of services to be retained through Kalvary hills by the RTA, Kozhikkode. In this circumstance this authority thinks it fare and proper to seek concurrence from the RTA, Kozhikkode for the variation of permit applied for. Hence adjourned.

Supplementary Item No: 5

Heard. The field officer has reported that the variation proposed is mostly beneficial to the traveling public. Hence the variation of permit granted subject to settlement of timings.

Supplementary Item No: 6

Heard.

1. Perused the judgment of Hon'ble High Court in WP(C)No.4908/2011 dated 19.04.2011 and STAT in MVARP No 343/2011 dated 08-11-2011.
2. In obedience to the order of Hon'ble STAT the conversion of service as Fast Passenger Service is granted subject to the renewal of regular permit. Considering the safety aspect and present road infrastructure it is also decided not to reduce running time by increasing the speed at which the service is operating and there fore there is no change in rate of running time and number of stops.

Supplementary Item No: 7

Secretary is allowed to seek concurrence of sister RTA Kozhikode and Thrissur

Supplementary Item No: 8

Secretary is allowed to seek concurrence of sister RTA Kozhikkode.

Supplementary Item No: 9

Secretary is allowed to seek concurrence of sister RTA Kozhikkode.

Supplementary Item No: 10

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

Supplementary Item No: 11

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

Supplementary Item No: 12

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

Supplementary Item No: 13

Secretary is allowed to seek concurrence of sister RTA Kozhikkode.

Supplementary Item No: 14

Heard. The change of vehicle with the S/C KL-11-S-9925 is allowed subject to production of current records. As regard to the request for allotment of timings of KL-10-F-7699 there is no evidence of surrender of permit of S/C KL-10-F-7699 or cancellation of the same on

account of default of service. Hence this authority is not in a position to issue an order in this regard. The settlement of timings with available time slots considering the objection of en route operators is left to the Secretary.

Supplementary Item No: 15

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Pullur to Tirur municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL 55 G 6691. As per the report of Joint RTO, Tirur this Autorikshaw was purchased with the financial aid of Kerala State Backward Classes Development Corporation, Malappuram unit under self employment scheme. Hence the applicant is eligible for exemption from the decision of RTA dated 21/10/2004 restricting Autorikshaw permit in municipalities. Hence regular variation of Autorikshaw permit granted with parking place at available parking area reported by Secretary, Tirur Municipality.

Supplementary Item No: 16

Heard. Perused the records. It is found that the applicant is donor for Renal transplantation as per the discharge summary of Kerala Institute of Medical Sciences and his application seems to be considered on compassionate ground. Hence the variation of permit granted changing the halting place from Angadipuram to Perintalmanna Municipality, giving him the exemption that allowed to the autorikshaw permit holders those who have availed the loan from any Government self employment scheme.

Supplementary Item No: 17

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Kalathode to Malappuram Municipality in respect of Autorikshaw KL-10-AF-8312. On perusal of records it is found that this Autorikshaw was purchased with the financial aid of Kerala State Backward Classes Development Corporation, Malappuram unit under self employment scheme. Hence the applicant is eligible for exemption from the decision of RTA dated 21/10/2004 restricting Autorikshaw permit in municipalities. Hence regular variation of Autorikshaw permit granted with parking place at Malappuram Municipality area.

Supplementary Item No: 18

Perused. Secretary is directed to implement the decision D3/875/STA/2005 dated 08/11/2011 of STA of Kerala.

Supplementary Item No: 19

Perused. This is matter pending consideration of Hon'ble Courts. Secretary is directed to bring the difficulties and adverse effects connected with this matter before the Hon'ble Courts at the time of filing statements and counter affidavits.

Supplementary Item No: 20

Heard. This is a request for shifting fare stage from. At present it is found that there is only 4 stages and is not found as excess and this RTA is not inclined for shifting of Fare Stages. Hence the application is not maintainable by this authority and is rejected.

Supplementary Item No: 21

Heard. This is an application for regular variation of permit by changing parking place from Angadipuram to Perinthalmanna in respect of the vehicle A/R KL-53-C-8496. As per the decision of this 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 Perinthalmanna municipality and also whether the applicant is a permanent resident of Perinthalmanna municipality. Hence adjourned.

Sd-/

Sri. P V Varghese
Deputy Transport Commissioner, CZ-I, Thrissur &
Member RTA Malappuram

Sd-/

Sri. K. Sethuraman , I.P.S.
Superintendent of Police Malappuram & Member RTA Malappuram

Sd-/

Sri. M.C. Mohandas, I.A.S.
District Collector & Chairman RTA Malappuram