

**DECISION OF THE MEETING OF THE REGIONAL
TRANSPORT AUTHORITY, KASARAGOD HELD ON
19-02-2025 AT 11.00 AM AT DISTRICT COLLECTORATE
CONFERENCE HALL, KASARAGOD**

Present:

1. SRI.K.INBASEKHAR IAS (DISTRICT COLLECTOR & CHAIRMAN)
2. SMT.D SHILPA,IPS (DISTRICT POLICE CHIEF & MEMBER)
3. SRI.C V M SHARIEF (DEPUTY TRANSPORT COMMISSIONER, NORTH ZONE & MEMBER)

Item No. 1

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

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

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

permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. No ready vehicle offered by the applicant.

The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

A portion of the route lies in Kannur district. *Concurrence shall be sought from RTA Kannur.* Hence application of fresh permit is **adjourned**.

Item No.2

Heard.Reconsidered the application on the route. The applicant has offered a ready vehicle Stage Carriage KL 60 K 0853. It is reported that the introduction of new service is beneficial to travelling public. No solid evidence regarding trafficking of permit is found out on enquiry. Hence regular permit **granted** to stage carriage KL 60 K 0853, subject to settlement of timings. The grantee shall submit the current records of stage carriage KL 60 K 0853, within one month from the date of receipt of proceedings regarding the grant, failing which the grant shall be revoked.

Item No. 3

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

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle "that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no

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

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

The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars thereof before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act. Hence application of fresh permit is **adjourned**.

Item No.4

Heard. This is an application for regular permit on the route **Cherupuzha-Bandadukka** Via:-Kadumeni-Kunnumkai-Bheemanadi-Vellarikundu-Balal-Rajapuram-Kolichal as ordinary service. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S.A.

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

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

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

The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars thereof before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

A portion of the route lies in Kannur district. Concurrence shall be sought from RTA Kannur. Hence application of fresh permit is **adjourned**.

Item No. 5

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

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

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

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

The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

A distance of 6.2 kms his in Kannur district. This authority decides to obtain concurrence from RTA Kannur. Hence application is **adjourned**.

Item No. 6

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

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

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

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

The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

A distance of 32.4 kms lies in Kannur district. This authority decides to obtain concurrence from RTA Kannur. Hence application of fresh permit is **adjourned**.

Item No. 7

Heard. Considered the application. It is reported that the proposed route overlaps the notified route for 5.3kms from Mavungal to Kanhangad New Bus stand and exceeds the permissible limit, specified in the notification. Moreover the major portions of the route are well served by Stage carriages including KSRTC. Hence **rejected**.

Item No. 8

This is an application for regular permit on the route Parappa – Nileswaram – Kunnumkai. During the hearing, objection are received against the timings, proposed by the applicant. Major portion of route is well served. The enquiry officer's report states that certain portion of the applied route is well served. It is not

specified, whether timings on the above portion can be settled without rigorous clash and moreover seating capacity of the proposed vehicle is not seen furnished in the application as specified under Sec 70 (b) of MV Act.

Secretary RTA shall conduct a specific enquiry regarding the objection, practicality of time schedule and receipt of required details of the proposed vehicle as per section 70 (b) of MV act. Hence **adjourned.**

Item No. 9

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

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

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

The enquiry officer's report states that certain portion of the applied route is well served. It is not specified, whether timings on the above portion can be settled with out rigorous clash and moreover seating capacity of the proposed vehicle is not seen furnished in the application as specified under Sec 70 (b) of MV Act.

*Secretary RTA shall conduct a specific enquiry regarding the objection, practicality of time schedule and receipt of required details of the proposed vehicle as per section 70 (b) of MV act.*Hence **adjourned.**

Item No. 10

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

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

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

facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application.

The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

The enquiry officer's report states that certain portion of the applied route is well served. It is not specified, whether timings on the above portion can be settled without rigorous clash and moreover seating capacity of the proposed vehicle is not seen furnished in the application as specified under Sec 70 (b) of MV Act.

*Secretary RTA shall conduct a specific enquiry regarding the objection, practicality of time schedule and receipt of required details of the proposed vehicle as per section 70 (b) of MV act. Hence **adjourned.***

Item No.11

Heard. It is reported that the proposed route is beneficial, since portion of route from Malom to Chulli and from Kalichanadukkam to Kanhirapoil is ill served. Hence regular permit **granted** to stage carriage KL60 Q 9849, subject to settlement of timings. The grantee shall submit the current records of stage carriage KL60 Q 9849, within one month from the date of receipt of proceedings regarding the grant, failing which the grant shall be revoked.

Item No. 12

This is an application for regular permit on the route Kanhirapoil-Kalichanadukkam-Kanhangad-Parappa-Nileswaram. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle

owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S.A.

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

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

The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars thereof before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

Virgin portion reported from Chalakkadavu to Erikukulam (2.2Kms), Moonu Road to Chayom School (2.5 kms) and from Kothothupara to Kalchandukkam (4km). *Secretary RTA shall obtain fitness certificate from the concerned authorities. Fare stages needed, if any, shall also be suggested by Secretary RTA. Hence adjourned.*

Item No. 13

Heard. Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle

owned by him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S.A.

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

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

The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars thereof before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

The enquiry officer's report states that certain portion of the applied route is well served. It is not specified, whether timings on the above portion can be settled without rigorous clash and moreover seating capacity of the proposed vehicle is not seen furnished in the application as specified under Sec 70 (2) of MV Act.

Secretary RTA shall conduct a specific enquiry regarding the objection, practicality of time schedule and receipt of required details of the proposed vehicle as per section 70 (2) of MV act. Hence **adjourned**.

Item No.14

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

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

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

Item No. 15

Heard. It is submitted before this authority during hearing that the portion of existing road on the proposed route is not fit for stage carriage service. An objection has been submitted by KSRTC, Mangaluru Division stating that only the Corporations of both the States of Karnataka and Kerala are entitled to provide Transport service to the public of this region based on the 3rd Interstate

agreement in the year 2001. Besides, the route overlaps the notified scheme from Mongral to Kumbala for 6 kms. This portion is nationalized route and the operation of private operators is frozen.

Moreover it is submitted that Karnataka State Government issued New Comprehensive Area notification on 07.03.2019, and hence there is no provision for grant of fresh permits, renewal and variation of route. It is also stated that the application for fresh stage carriage permit is traversing through the enclave portion situated in Karnataka State and the application have to be made before STA and not before RTA.

Hence Secretary RTA shall seek clarification from RTO Mangalore regarding the existing schemes and details of overlapping. Secretary RTA shall also obtain clarification from STA Kerala regarding the feasibility of considering the application on enclaved route. **Adjourned.**

Item No. 16

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

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

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

The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

The enquiry officer's report states that certain portion of the applied route is well served. It is not specified, whether timings on the above portion can be settled without rigorous clash and moreover seating capacity of the proposed vehicle is not seen furnished in the application as specified under Sec 70 (2) of MV Act.

Secretary RTA shall conduct a specific enquiry regarding the objection, practicality of time schedule and receipt of required details of the proposed vehicle as per section 70 (2) of MV act. Hence adjourned.

Item No. 17

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

The applicant has offered a "suitable vehicle" that has no existence outside his own imagination. This authority is under no

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

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

Item No.18

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

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

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

Item No.19

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

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

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

The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

The enquiry officer's report states that certain portion of the applied route is well served. It is not specified, whether timings on the above portion can be settled with out rigorous clash and moreover seating capacity of the proposed vehicle is not seen furnished in the application as specified under Sec 70 (2) of MV Act.

*Secretary RTA shall conduct a specific enquiry regarding the objection, practicality of time schedule and receipt of required details of the proposed vehicle as per section 70 (2) of MV act. Hence **adjourned.***

Item No. 20

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

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

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

The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

It is reported that a distance of 3.2 kms lies in the notified scheme. *The exact details of overlapping and whether violates relevant clauses of scheme not seen reported. Secretary RTA shall conduct an enquiry and submit a detailed report in this regard.*

Hence application of permit is **adjourned**.

Item No. 21

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

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

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

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

The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2)of Motor Vehicles Act.

It is submitted before this authority during hearing that there exists four routes on the proposed route and the route suggested by the applicant is not specific. *The total distance of overlapping and whether violates relevant clauses of notification not mentioned. Hence Secretary RTA shall conduct a detailed enquiry in this regard and submit a report.***Adjourned.**

Item No.22

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

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

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

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

Item No. 23

Heard. An objection has been submitted by KSRTC, Mangaluru Division stating that only the Corporations of both the States of Karnataka and Kerala are entitled to provide Transport service to the public of this region based on the 3rd Interstate agreement in the year 2001.

Moreover it is submitted that Karnataka State Government issued New Comprehensive Area notification on 07.03.2019, and hence there is no provision for grant of fresh permits, renewal and variation of route. It is also stated that the application for fresh stage carriage permit is traversing through the enclave portion situated in Karnataka State and the application have to be made before STA and not before RTA.

*Hence Secretary RTA shall seek clarification from RTO Mangalure regarding the existing schemes and details of overlapping. Secretary RTA shall also obtain clarification from STA Kerala regarding the feasibility of considering the application on enclaved route. **Adjourned.***

Item No. 24

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

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

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

Item No.25

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

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

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

The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars thereof before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

It is reported that a distance of 3.5kms lies in the notified scheme. The exact details of overlapping and whether violates relevant clauses of scheme not seen reported. Secretary RTA shall conduct an enquiry and submit a detailed report in this regard.

Hence application of permit is **adjourned**.

Item No.26

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

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

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

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor Vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. *No ready vehicle offered by the applicant. The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars thereof before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act*

It is submitted before this authority during hearing that the portion of existing road on the proposed route is not fit for stage carriage service. An objection has been submitted by KSRTC, Mangaluru Division stating that only the Corporations of both the States of Karnataka and Kerala are entitled to provide Transport service to the public of this region based on the 3rd Interstate agreement in the year 2001.

Moreover it is submitted that Karnataka State Government issued New Comprehensive Area notification on 07.03.2019, and hence there is no provision for grant of fresh permits, renewal and variation of route. It is also stated that the application for fresh

stage carriage permit is traversing through the enclave portion situated in Karnataka State and the application have to be made before STA and not before RTA.

Hence Secretary RTA shall seek clarification from RTO Mangalore regarding the existing schemes and details of overlapping. Secretary RTA shall also obtain clarification from STA Kerala regarding the feasibility of considering the application on enclaved route. Adjourned.

Item No. 27

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

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

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

The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

The enquiry officer's report states that certain portion of the applied route is well served. It is not specified, whether timings on the above portion can be settled with out rigorous clash and moreover seating capacity of the proposed vehicle is not seen furnished in the application as specified under Sec 70 (2) of MV Act.

Secretary RTA shall conduct a specific enquiry regarding the objection, practicality of time schedule and receipt of required details of the proposed vehicle as per section 70 (2) of MV act. Hence adjourned.

Item No. 28

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

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

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

The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars thereof before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

The enquiry officer's report states that certain portion of the applied route is well served. It is not specified, whether timings on the above portion can be settled without rigorous clash and moreover seating capacity of the proposed vehicle is not seen furnished in the application as specified under Sec 70 (2) of MV Act.

Secretary RTA shall conduct a specific enquiry regarding the objection, practicality of time schedule and receipt of required details of the proposed vehicle as per section 70 (2) of MV act.

*Secretary RTA shall also enquire and report whether there is enough space for a stage carriage to park and turn without hindering the normal traffic at Cherupuzha Bridge, a terminus. Hence **adjourned.***

Item No. 29

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

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

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

The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars thereof before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

The enquiry officer's report states that certain portion of the applied route is well served. It is not specified, whether timings on the above portion can be settled without rigorous clash and moreover seating capacity of the proposed vehicle is not seen furnished in the application as specified under Sec 70 (2) of MV Act.

Secretary RTA shall conduct a specific enquiry regarding the objection, practicality of time schedule and receipt of required details of the proposed vehicle as per section 70 (2) of MV act. Hence
adjourned.

Item No.30

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

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

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. No ready vehicle offered by the applicant. *The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act*

An objection has been submitted by KSRTC, Mangaluru Division stating that only the Corporations of both the States of Karnataka and Kerala are entitled to provide Transport service to the public of this region based on the 3rd Interstate agreement in the year 2001.

Moreover it is submitted that Karnataka State Government issued New Comprehensive Area notification on 07.03.2019, and hence there is no provision for grant of fresh permits, renewal and variation of route. It is also stated that the application for fresh stage carriage permit is traversing through the enclave portion situated in Karnataka State and the application have to be made before STA and not before RTA.

Hence Secretary RTA shall seek clarification from RTO Mangalore regarding the existing schemes and details of overlapping. Secretary RTA shall also obtain clarification from STA Kerala regarding the feasibility of considering the application on enclaved route. Adjourned.

Item No.31

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

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

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

permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. No ready vehicle offered by the applicant. Moreover major portion of route is well served. Hence application of permit is **rejected**.

Item No.32

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

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

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. No ready vehicle offered by the applicant. *The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars thereof before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act*

An objection has been submitted by KSRTC, Mangaluru Division stating that only the Corporations of both the States of Karnataka and Kerala are entitled to provide Transport service to the public of this region based on the 3rd Interstate agreement in the year 2001.

Moreover it is submitted that Karnataka State Government issued New Comprehensive Area notification on 07.03.2019, and hence there is no provision for grant of fresh permits, renewal and variation of route. It is also stated that the application for fresh stage carriage permit is traversing through the enclave portion situated in Karnataka State and the application have to be made before STA and not before RTA.

Hence Secretary RTA shall seek clarification from RTO Mangalure regarding the existing schemes and details of overlapping. Secretary RTA shall also obtain clarification from STA Kerala regarding the feasibility of considering the application on enclaved route. Adjourned.

Item No.33

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

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

to a non-existent vehicle would not serve any public purpose. On the other hand, it will only help promote illegal sale and trafficking in permit.

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. No ready vehicle offered by the applicant. *The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.*

It is alleged that distance from Galiyadukka to Bayur road is 800 meters only and fitness certificate is obtained for this portion only. No fitness certificate received for the remaining 1.2 kms. *Secretary RTA shall make necessary enquiry regarding the actual distance of virgin portion and ensure that fitness certificate is obtained from the concerned authorities for conducting stage carriage service.* **Adjourned**

Item No.34

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

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

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

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. No ready vehicle offered by the applicant. *The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars thereof before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act*

An objection has been submitted by KSRTC, Mangaluru Division stating that only the Corporations of both the States of Karnataka and Kerala are entitled to provide Transport service to the public of this region based on the 3rd Interstate agreement in the year 2001.

Moreover it is submitted that Karnataka State Government issued New Comprehensive Area notification on 07.03.2019, and hence there is no provision for grant of fresh permits, renewal and variation of route. It is also stated that the application for fresh stage carriage permit is traversing through the enclave portion situated in Karnataka State and the application have to be made before STA and not before RTA.

Hence Secretary RTA shall seek clarification from RTO Mangalure regarding the existing schemes and details of overlapping. Secretary RTA shall also obtain clarification from STA Kerala regarding the feasibility of considering the application on enclaved route. Adjourned.

Item No.35

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

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

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

Item No.36

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

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

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

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor Vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. No ready vehicle offered by the applicant. *The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars thereof before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.*

It is alleged that distance from Galiyadukka to Bayur road is 800 meters only and fitness certificate is obtained for this portion only. No fitness certificate received for the remaining 1.2 kms. *Secretary RTA shall make necessary enquiry regarding the actual distance of virgin portion and ensure that fitness certificate is obtained from the concerned authorities for conducting stage carriage service.* **Adjourned**

Item No.37

Applicant has not, even at the time of hearing today, furnished the registration mark and other particulars of any vehicle owned by

him. No person other than the owner of a motor vehicle is entitled to a permit authorising him to use the vehicle as a transport vehicle as per the provisions of section 66 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and as prescribed in form P.St.S.A.

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

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. No ready vehicle offered by the applicant. *The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars thereof before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act*

An objection has been submitted by KSRTC, Mangaluru Division stating that only the Corporations of both the States of Karnataka and Kerala are entitled to provide Transport service to the public of this region based on the 3rd Interstate agreement in the year 2001.

Moreover it is submitted that Karnataka State Government issued New Comprehensive Area notification on 07.03.2019, and hence there is no provision for grant of fresh permits, renewal and variation of route. It is also stated that the application for fresh

stage carriage permit is traversing through the enclave portion situated in Karnataka State and the application have to be made before STA and not before RTA.

*Hence Secretary RTA shall seek clarification from RTO Mangalore regarding the existing schemes and details of overlapping. Secretary RTA shall also obtain clarification from STA Kerala regarding the feasibility of considering the application on enclaved route. **Adjourned.***

Item No. 38

Heard. It is reported that the major portion of the route is ill served and introduction of new service is beneficial to travelling public. Hence regular permit **granted** to stage carriage KL 14 E 5099 subject to settlement of timings. The grantee shall submit the current records of stage carriage KL 14E5099, within one month from the date of receipt of proceedings regarding the grant, failing which the grant shall be revoked.

Item No. 39

Heard. It is reported that the proposed route overlaps the notified route for 1.8kms from Kasargod KSRTC bus stand to Kasargod New bus stand. The permissible overlapping is 1.6kms only. *Secretary RTA shall submit a detailed report regarding the feasibility of overlapping in this regard.*

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

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

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. No ready vehicle offered by the applicant. *The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars thereof before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.* **Adjourned**

Item No.40

Heard. Virgin portion for 9.5 kms from Thrikaripur South Kadapuram to Valiyaparamba junction reported. *Secretary RTA shall obtain fitness certificate from the concerned authorities and place before next RTA.* **Adjourned.**

Item No.41

Heard. It is reported that major portion of the route is ill served and additional bus service in this area is beneficial to the travelling public, including students. Hence regular permit **granted** to stage carriage KL 57 B 7477, subject to settlement of timings. The grantee shall submit the current records of stage carriage KL

57B 7477, within one month from the date of receipt of proceedings regarding the grant, failing which the grant shall be revoked.

Item No. 42

Heard. It is reported that major portion of the route is ill served and additional bus service in this area is beneficial to the travelling public, including students. Hence regular permit **granted** to stage carriage KL 18 C 6537, subject to settlement of timings. The grantee shall submit the current records of stage carriage KL 18C6537, within one month from the date of receipt of proceedings regarding the grant, failing which the grant shall be revoked.

Item No.43

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

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

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

applicant. Moreover major portion of route is well served. Hence application of permit is **rejected**.

Item No.44

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

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

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

Item No.45

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

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

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

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

The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars thereof before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

The enquiry officer's report states that certain portion of the applied route is well served. It is not specified, whether timings on the above portion can be settled without rigorous clash and moreover seating capacity of the proposed vehicle is not seen furnished in the application as specified under Sec 70 (2) of MV Act.

Secretary RTA shall conduct a specific enquiry regarding the objection, practicality of time schedule and receipt of required details

of the proposed vehicle as per section 70 (2) of MV act. Hence adjourned.

Item No.46

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

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

The time limit prescribed in KMV Rule 159 (2) is to produce the registration certificate of the vehicle in favour of which a permit has been granted if any, for the purpose of making entry in the permit in terms of section 85 of the Motor vehicles Act and not for facilitating the applicant to procure ownership of a vehicle after the sanction of the application. No ready vehicle offered by the applicant. *The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars thereof before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act*

An objection has been submitted by KSRTC, Mangaluru Division stating that only the Corporations of both the States of Karnataka and Kerala are entitled to provide Transport service to

the public of this region based on the 3rd Interstate agreement in the year 2001.

Moreover it is submitted that Karnataka State Government issued New Comprehensive Area notification on 07.03.2019, and hence there is no provision for grant of fresh permits, renewal and variation of route. It is also stated that the application for fresh stage carriage permit is traversing through the enclave portion situated in Karnataka State and the application have to be made before STA and not before RTA.

*Hence Secretary RTA shall seek clarification from RTO Mangalore regarding the existing schemes and details of overlapping. Secretary RTA shall also obtain clarification from STA Kerala regarding the feasibility of considering the application on enclaved route. **Adjourned.***

Item No. 47

Heard.

1. Considered the application for renewal of permit. Regular permit expired on 26/04/2022. Application for renewal of permit submitted only on 27/02/2023 which is belated and beyond the permissible limit as specified in section 81(3) of MV act. Hence **rejected**.
2. Primary permit is invalid. Hence application for replacement **rejected**.

Item No.48

Heard. Variation involves curtailment of trips at 7.00 pm from Periya to Kanhangad, Kanhangad to Palachal and back to Periya. It is reported that the proposed curtailment is not beneficial to travelling public and affects the night passengers. Hence **rejected**.

Item No.49

Heard. A distance of 4.5 kms from Thodugoli to Bakery junction is reported as virgin portion. Fitness certificate has to be obtained. *Secretary RTA shall obtain fitness certificate from the concerned authorities. The advantages and disadvantages by the proposed variation have to be ascertained Secretary RTA shall conduct a detailed enquiry and submit specific report.* Hence **adjourned.**

Item No. 50

Heard. Considered the application. Secretary RTA shall conduct detailed enquiry and report on the following points.

1. Whether total variation exceeds the permissible limit of 24kms.
2. Whether the running time is proposed on the deviation portion violates the allotted running time on the sector (Odayamchal to Vellarikkundu)

Adjourned.

Item No. 51

Heard. Considered the application. Secretary RTA shall conduct a detailed enquiry and report on the following aspects.

1. Frequency of services on the existing route and proposed deviation portion.
2. Impact of variation on the travelling public.
3. Advantages and disadvantages and necessity of variation under Rule 145(7) of KMV rules
4. Genuiness of complaint submitted by the students of ITI.

Adjourned.

Item No. 52

Heard. It is reported that variation involves one additional trip from Kasargod to Seethamgoli and is beneficial to travelling public. Hence variation **granted** subject to settlement of timings.

Item No.53

Heard.Considered the application for variation. Variation involves extension of one round trip and curtailment of one round trip. Secretary RTA shall conduct an enquiry and report

1. Whether extension of trip violates Clause 19 of G.O (P) No. 13/2023/ trans
2. The impact of curtailment, advantages and disadvantages to the travelling public shall also be enquired and reported.
Hence **adjourned**.

Item No. 54

Heard. Variation involves extension from Alinkeezhil to Bangalam and curtailment of last trip from Neeleswaram to Kanhangad. It is noticed that an additional trip from Neeleswaram to Kanhangad is provided to facilitate the change of halting place. *Secretary RTA shall enquire and report whether the additional trip violates Clause 19 of G.O(P) No. 13/2023/ trans.***Adjourned.**

Item No.55

Absent. **Adjourned.**

Item No.56

Heard. It is reported that proposed variation is beneficial to travelling public. Hence **granted**, subject to settlement of timings.

Item No. 57

Heard. It is submitted before this authority during the hearing, that the distance involved in variation, exceeds the permissible

limit. The advantages and disadvantages of extension and curtailment shall also be looked into in detail. *Secretary RTA shall conduct an enquiry and submit detailed report on the above matter.***Adjourned.**

Item No.58

Heard. Considered the application

1. Virgin portion for 0.5 km from Pettikund junction to Cheruvappadi reported. Secretary RTA shall obtain fitness certificate from the concerned authorities.
2. As per the existing time schedule, stage carriage departs from Payyanur at 9.40 Am and reaches Cheruvathur at 10.20 AM. But as per the proposed time schedule, stage carriage departs from Payyanur at 9.40 Am and reaches Cheruvathur at 10.10 AM. The difference in the running time shall be looked into and reported.
3. Advantages and disadvantages of extension and curtailment shall be reported.**Adjourned.**

Item No. 59

Heard. Variation involves introduction of additional trip from Kanathur to Kuttikkol to facilitate change in halting place and it is reported that the variation is beneficial to the travelling public. Hence **granted** ,subject to settlement of timings.

Item No.60

Heard. On verification, it is seen that this authority in the meeting held on 08/02/2024 vide item No. 7 had directed secretary RTA to ascertain the suitability of proposed time schedule and

extension of trips without curtailment of existing trips. *The suitability report not seen submitted by Secretary RTA.* Secretary RTA shall conduct detailed report as directed by this authority. **Adjourned.**

Item No. 61

Heard. Variation involves curtailment of portion of route from Dharmathadka to Bayarpadav for a distance of 7 kms. It is reported that this portion is ill served and adversely affect the travelling public, including students. Hence **rejected**.

Item No.62

Heard. Variation is sought for extension of service from Mulleriya to Gadigudde. It is reported that extension is beneficial to the travelling public. Hence **granted**, subject to settlement of timings.

Item No.63

Heard. Considered the application. The variation involves extension and curtailment. Advantages and disadvantages of curtailment over extension have to be considered. Frequency of services on the extended and curtailment portion also has to be taken into. *Secretary RTA shall conduct a detailed enquiry and report in this matter.* **Adjourned.**

Item No. 64

Heard. It is reported that deviation portion is ill served and introduction of new service is beneficial to travelling public. It is also reported that curtailment proposed is through well served area and does not seriously affect the passengers. Hence variation **granted**, subject to settlement of timings.

Item No. 65

Heard. Permit holder applied for variation of trip by extending one round trip from Adoor to Devaradukkam. It is reported that extension is through an ill-served area and is beneficial to the travelling public. Hence **granted**, subject to settlement of timings.

Item No.66

Heard. On verification of proposed time schedule, curtailment of trip from Berika to Miyapada of 6.55 AM is notified. *Secretary RTA shall look into this matter and submit a detailed report on the impact of curtailment.***Adjourned.**

Item No.67

Heard.Considered the application. The variation involves extension and curtailment. Advantages and disadvantages of curtailment over extension have to be considered. Frequency of services on the extended and curtailment portion also has to be taken into.*Secretary RTA shall conduct a detailed enquiry and report in this matter.***Adjourned.**

Item No. 68

Heard. Reconsidered the application for fresh permit on the route Kizhakkemuri- Cheruvathur- Payyannur- Madakkal- Padannakadapuram. The application was considered and adjourned by this authority, in the meeting held on 14/12/2023, vide item No. 2, for want of concurrence from RTA Kannur, since portion of route lies in Kannur district. Request for concurrence was considered by RTA Kannur, in the meeting held on 20/02/2024, vide item No 29. RTA Kannur rejected the request for concurrence on the ground that the proposed route is well served and introduction of new service results in time clash with existing services. Major portion of the route is well served and amicable settlement of timings avoiding time clashes with existing operators

is not possible. Moreover no ready vehicle is offered by the applicant. This authority feels that there is no necessity of introduction of new service on the route applied. Hence **rejected**.

Item No. 69

Concurrence **granted** as ordinary service.

Item No. 70

Heard, Transfer of permit **allowed** subject to

1. Clearance of dues to Govt, if any.
2. Production of NOC from financier, if applicable.

Item No. 71

Heard, Transfer of permit **allowed** subject to

1. Clearance of dues to Govt, if any.
2. Production of NOC from financier, if applicable.

Item No. 72

Heard, Transfer of permit **allowed** subject to

1. Clearance of dues to Govt, if any.
2. Production of NOC from financier, if applicable.

Item No. 73

Heard, Transfer of permit **allowed** subject to

1. Clearance of dues to Govt, if any.
2. Production of NOC from financier, if applicable.

Item No. 74

Heard, Transfer of permit **allowed** subject to

1. Clearance of dues to Govt, if any.
2. Production of NOC from financier, if applicable.

Item No. 75

Heard, Transfer of permit **allowed** subject to

1. Clearance of dues to Govt, if any.
2. Production of NOC from financier, if applicable.

Item No. 76

Heard, Transfer of permit **allowed** subject to

1. Clearance of dues to Govt, if any.
2. Production of NOC from financier, if applicable.

Item No. 77

Heard, Transfer of permit **allowed** subject to

1. Clearance of dues to Govt, if any.
2. Production of NOC from financier, if applicable.

Item No. 78

Heard, Transfer of permit **allowed** subject to

1. Clearance of dues to Govt, if any.
2. Production of NOC from financier, if applicable.

Item No. 79

Heard. This is a request to refix the irregularities in fare stages on the following routes.

1. Kanhangad – Panathur (via) Mavungal, Odayamchal
2. Kanhangad – Konnakkad (via) Mavungal, Odayamchal, Vellarikkundu
3. Kanhangad – Kalichanadukkam (via) Mavungal, Ezhammile.

Detailed enquiry was conducted by Secretary RTA. The routes in question were inspected by the field officers of Motor Vehicle Department along with petitioner, representatives of bus owners association and detailed report submitted.

Perused the report and recommendation. Certain anomalies were noticed in the existing fare stages. The distance between fare stages, road conditions, importance of places were taken into consideration. This authority under Rule 211 of KMV Rules **fix and approve** the fare stages of the following routes. Fares shall be collected according to the stages.

1. Kanhangad – Panathur (via) Mavungal, Odayamchal

Place	Fare Stage
Alamippaly NBS	0
Kanhangad old bus stand	1
Mavungal	2
Kottappara	3
Parappally	4
Mutticharal	5
Eriya School	6
Ennappara Junction	7
Attenganam	8
Odayamchal	9
Padimaruth	10
Poodumkallu	11

Vannathikkanam	12
Kallar2nd	13
Malakkal Hospital	14
Kolichal2nd	15
Panathadi	16
Balamthode	17
Perutharakayam	18
Panathur Bus stand	19

2. Kanhangad – Konnakkad (via)Mavungal, Odayamchal, Vellarikkundu

The existing stages at Pungamchal and Kallamchira are avoided.

Place	Fare Stage
Konnakkad	0
Maloth HSS	1
Maloth	2
Nattakkal	3
Punnakkunnu	4
Pathikkara	5
Vellarikkundu	6
Kallamchira	7
Kanakapallythattu	8
Parapa	9
Edathode	10
Naykayam	11
Odayamchal	12
Attenganam	13
Ennappara Junction	14
Eriya School	15
Mutticharal	16
Parappally	17
Kottappara	18
Mavungal	19
Kanhangad old bus stand	20

Alamippaly	21
------------	----

3. Kanhangad – Kalichanadukkam (via)Mavungal,
Ezhammile

At present 13 stages exist for the total 28.1 Kms. Hence existing 5 stages between Ezham mile and Kalichanadukkam is modified to 3 stages.

Place	Fare Stage
Alamippaly NBS	0
Kanhangad old bus stand	1
Mavungal	2
Kottappara	3
Parappally	4
Mutticharal	5
Eriya School	6
Ennappara Junction (Ezhammile)	7
Mukkuzhi Junction	8
Ennappara	9
Ettupothipad	10
Kalichanadukkam	11

Item No. 80

Heard, as per the decision in the 22nd meeting of SITCO,
Counter signature is granted.

Item No. 81

Heard, as per the decision in the 22nd meeting of SITCO,
Counter signature is granted.

Item No. 82

Heard, as per the decision in the 22nd meeting of SITCO,
Counter signature is granted.

Item No.83

Heard, as per the decision in the 22nd meeting of SITCO,
Counter signature is granted.

Item No. 84

Heard, as per the decision in the 22nd meeting of SITCO,
Counter signature is granted.

Item No. 85

Heard, as per the decision in the 22nd meeting of SITCO,
Counter signature is granted.

Item No. 86

Heard, as per the decision in the 22nd meeting of SITCO,
Counter signature is granted.

Item No. 87

Heard, as per the decision in the 22nd meeting of SITCO,
Counter signature is granted.

Item No. 88

Heard, as per the decision in the 22nd meeting of SITCO,
Counter signature is granted.

Item No. 89

Ratified.

Item No. 90

Will be informed

Supplementary Item No. 1

Heard. Regular permit in respect of SC KL 13 J 3186 expired on 10/01/2020. Permit holder applied for renewal of permit on 09.01.2020. The permit holder was directed to produce the current records to endorse the renewal of permit. The permit holder failed to produce the current records of SC KL 13 J 3186. The permit holder has now submitted application for replacement with SC KL 10 AC 7833 on the strength of lease agreement. The whereabouts of SC KL 13 J 3186 is not known and the permit holder neither produced the vehicle nor informed about the garage of vehicle. Hence it is presumed that the SC KL 13 J 3186 is not in existence and the permit automatically ceases to exist. Moreover SC KL 13 J 3186 is in tax arrears. The permit holder failed to avail the permit renewed in time. Considered the application u/s 86(1)(C) of MV act, Rule 145, 152 and 159(1) of KMV Rules. The permit holder is not eligible for renewal of permit. Hence **rejected**.

The permit is invalid. Hence replacement **rejected**.

Supplementary Item No. 2

Heard, Transfer of permit **allowed** subject to

1. Clearance of dues to Govt, if any.
2. Production of NOC from financier, if applicable.

Supplementary Item No.3

Heard. An objection has been submitted by KSRTC, Mangaluru Division stating that only the Corporations of both the States of Karnataka and Kerala are entitled to provide Transport service to the public of this region based on the 3rd Interstate agreement in the year 2001.

Moreover it is submitted that Karnataka State Government issued New Comprehensive Area notification on 07.03.2019, and hence there is no provision for grant of fresh permits, renewal and variation of route. It is also stated that the application for fresh stage carriage permit is traversing through the enclave portion situated in Karnataka State and the application have to be made before STA and not before RTA.

*Hence Secretary RTA shall seek clarification from RTO Mangalure regarding the existing schemes and details of overlapping. Secretary RTA shall also obtain clarification from STA Kerala regarding the feasiblilty of considering the application on enclaved route. **Adjourned.***

Supplementary Item No. 4

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

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

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

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

The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars thereof before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

The enquiry officer's report states that certain portion of the applied route is well served. It is not specified, whether timings on the above portion can be settled without rigorous clash and moreover seating capacity of the proposed vehicle is not seen furnished in the application as specified under Sec 70 (2) of MV Act.

Secretary RTA shall conduct a specific enquiry regarding the objection, practicality of time schedule and receipt of required details of the proposed vehicle as per section 70 (2) of MV act. Hence
adjourned.

Supplementary Item No. 5

Heard. It is reported that major portion of the route, is ill served and introduction of service is beneficial to public. Hence regular permit **granted** to SC KL 11 W 8577, subject to settlement of timings. The grantee shall submit the current records of stage carriage KL 11W8577, within one month from the date of receipt of proceedings regarding the grant, failing which the grant shall be revoked.

Supplementary Item No. 6

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

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

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

sanction of the application. No ready vehicle offered by the applicant. *The application shall be considered, when the applicant has acquired the ownership of a ready vehicle and furnished the registration mark and their particulars there of before this authority as prescribed in the form P.St.Sa. under section 70 (2) of Motor Vehicles Act*

An objection has been submitted by KSRTC, Mangaluru Division stating that only the Corporations of both the States of Karnataka and Kerala are entitled to provide Transport service to the public of this region based on the 3rd Interstate agreement in the year 2001.

Moreover it is submitted that Karnataka State Government issued New Comprehensive Area notification on 07.03.2019, and hence there is no provision for grant of fresh permits, renewal and variation of route. It is also stated that the application for fresh stage carriage permit is traversing through the enclave portion situated in Karnataka State and the application have to be made before STA and not before RTA.

*Hence Secretary RTA shall seek clarification from RTO Mangalure regarding the existing schemes and details of overlapping. Secretary RTA shall also obtain clarification from STA Kerala regarding the feasiblilty of considering the application on enclaved route. **Adjourned.***

Supplementary Item No. 7

Heard. Regular permit in respect of SC KL 51 C 0418, expired on 19/11/2020. Application for renewal submitted on 28/12/2020 without payment of prescribed fees. Fees for renewal submitted only on 06/03/25. The application is belated and is beyond the permissible limit. Hence **rejected.**

Supplementary Item No. 8

Heard. Regular permit in respect of SC KL 60 G 2310 expired on 26/11/2019. Renewal application submitted only on 05/08/2024 by another person Sri Yusuf, who is not the permit holder. Application also submitted for replacement with SC KL60 V 5679, under lease agreement. On Verification, it is noticed that both SC KL60 G 2310 and KL 60 V 5679 are covered by regular permits. The renewal of permit application cannot be considered as a valid one. Hence **rejected**.

Primary permit is invalid and application for replacement is also **rejected**. The permit KL 14/4/30/1989 issued to conduct service on the route Konnakkal to Kanhangad stands **revoked** on the basis of above grounds.

Supplementary Item No. 9

Heard, Transfer of permit **allowed** subject to

- 1 Clearance of dues to Govt, if any.
- 2 Production of NOC from financier, if applicable.

Supplementary Item No. 10

Heard, Transfer of permit **allowed** subject to

- 1 Clearance of dues to Govt, if any.
- 2 Production of NOC from financier, if applicable.

Supplementary Item No. 11

Heard, Transfer of permit **allowed** subject to

- 1 Clearance of dues to Govt, if any.
- 2 Production of NOC from financier, if applicable.

Supplementary Item No. 12

Heard. It is reported that additional trip requested is beneficial to the travelling public. Hence variation **granted** subject to settlement of timings.

Supplementary Item No. 13

Heard. The grantee was directed to produce the records of a ready vehicle to avail the permit granted by RTA. The grantee failed to produce the current records and submitted that he possess a stage carriage on the basis of lease agreement. No records or vehicle agreement were produced before Secretary RTA.

In view of the above circumstance the grant of regular permit on the route Cherkala- Kundamkuzhi - Odayamchal. Vellarikkundu stands **revoked**.

Supplementary Item No.14

Heard. On 2/4/2024, the grantee was directed to produce records of a ready vehicle to avail the permit granted by this authority in the meeting held on 08/02/2024, vide item No. 5. Application to allow maximum time to produce the records were submitted only on 27/07/2024, after the permissible period. No records were produced so far.

In view of above circumstances the grant of regular permit on the route Mulleriya – Bodiyaadukka- Kumbala stands **revoked**.


Supplementary Item No. 15

Heard. This authority in its meeting held on 13/06/2024 vide item No. 3 granted regular permit subject to settlement of timings. On 05/07/2024, the grantee was directed to produce the current records to avail the granted permit. The grantee did not submit any application for time extension nor submitted records of the vehicle.

In view of above circumstances, the grant of regular permit on the route Cheruvathur – Kayyur – Cheemeni – Pothavoor- Neeleswaram stands **revoked**.

Supplementary Item No. 16

Heard. Directed to implement with effect from 01/04/2025.


1. SRI.K.INBASEKHAR IAS (DISTRICT COLLECTOR & CHAIRMAN)

2. SMT.D SHILPA,IPS



(DISTRICT POLICE CHIEF & MEMBER)

3. SRI.C V M SHARIEF



C.V.M Sharief
Deputy Transport Commissioner
(North Zone), Kozhikode

(DEPUTY TRANSPORTCOMMISSIONER,
NORTH ZONE & MEMBER)