

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF  
THE REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY - ERNAKULAM  
HELD ON 10.06.2025**

**Present**

**Chairman**

Sri. NSK. Umesh IAS, District Collector, Ernakulam

**Members**

1. Smt. Hemalatha M. IPS, District Police Chief, Ernakulam Rural, Aluva.
2. Sri. Anoop Varkey, Deputy Transport Commissioner (Law), CZ-II  
Ernakulam.

**Item.No.1**

**07G1/145/2024/KL 07**

The application for grant of fresh stage carriage permit on the route Aniyil beach- Edavanakkad- Vyttila Hub via Njarakkal, Gosree bridge, High court, Menaka, Kadavanthara as ordinary mofussil service has again come up for consideration. Heard the applicant Sri. Abinraj K T, Kunnummathara house Moothukunnam P.O. He has not yet offered either a specific vehicle or the particulars of a vehicle even at the time of consideration of application today. No purpose will be served by granting a stage carriage permit to a non-existent vehicle. "Suitable vehicle" offered by the applicant falls within the imagination of the applicant only. However in the view of judgement and order in WP(C) No.44910/2024 dtd.28.02.2025 of Hon'ble High Court of Kerala. Permit is **granted** subject to the specified description of vehicle under section 72(2) of MV Act and the following conditions.

1. The so called "suitable vehicle" offered by the applicant shall be of Type II category duly registered as such for inter urban/intercity transport as per AIS:052 standards in terms of rule 125 C of CMV rules 1989 which deals with code of practice for Bus body design and

approval, so as to ensure minimum standards of safety and comfort of passengers.

2. The vehicle shall be of BS-VI exhaust emission standards under rule 115 of CMV rules 1989. So as to ensure environmental protection and public safety placing reliance on judgement in WA No. 454 of 2023 (JRTO v/s Thomas Joseph) of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala.
3. The time schedule furnished by the applicant shall be modified in conformity with the provisions of sections 91 of MV Act and 13 of The Motor Transport Workers Act and rule 188 of KMV rules.
4. Settlement of timings after hearing interested operators.

## **Item.No.2**

**J1/07N1/289/2023**

Heard the applicant Sri.Arun PA, Panikkassery house, Njarakkal PO. The application for grant of fresh stage carriage permit on the route VeliyathaamParambu Beach- Vyttila Hub Via Njarakkal, Gosree bridge, High court, Menaka, Kadavanthara as ordinary motor service has again come up for consideration. He has not yet offered either a specific vehicle or the particulars of a vehicle even at the time of consideration of application today. No purpose will be served by granting a stage carriage permit to a non-existent vehicle. "Suitable vehicle" offered by the applicant falls within the imagination of the applicant only. However in the view of judgement and order in WP(C) No.497/2025 dtd.28.02.2025 of Hon'ble High Court of Kerala Permit is **granted** subject to the specified description of vehicle under section 72(2) of MV Act and the following conditions.

1. The so called "suitable vehicle" offered by the applicant shall be of Type II category duly registered as such for inter urban/intercity transport as per AIS:052 standard in terms of rule 125 C of CMV rules 1989 which deals with code of practice for Bus body design and approval, so as to ensure minimum standards of safety and comfort of passengers.
2. The vehicle shall be of BS-VI exhaust emission standards under rule 115 of CMV rules 1989, so as to ensure environmental protection and

public safety for which this authority places reliance on judgement in WA No. 454 of 2023 (JRTO v/s Thomas Joseph) of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala.

3. The time schedule shall be settled after hearing in interested operators.
4. The time schedule furnished by the applicant shall be modified in conformity with the provisions of sections 91 of MV Act and 13 of The Motor Transport Workers Act and rule 188 of KMV rules.

### **Item.No.3 J1/KL231015T1421143/2023/E**

Heard the applicant Sri. Bushra PM, Chunagumthara house Ezhupunna, Alappuzha and objectors. This is an application for grant of fresh regular stage carriage permit in respect of vehicle bearing registration mark KL07BJ3339 to operate on the route Kumbalam North-Medical College Via Kumbalam, Vyttila Hub, Edappally Junction, Cheranalloor private bus stand, Edappally Toll junction, Vallathole Junction, HMT Junction, Govt. Medical College as ordinary mofussil service.

Permit is **granted** subject to the following conditions:

1. All the trips shall be run and operated on the entire route between the termini Kumbalam North and Medical College without there being any cut trips in between.
2. The time schedule shall be settled in such a way that the working hours of the persons employed by the applicant shall be in conformity with the provisions of Section 91 of the Act and Section 13 of the Motor Transport Workers Act, 1961 and rule 188 of KMV rules.
3. Settlement of timings after hearing interested operators.

### **Item.No.4 07G1/74/2025/KL07**

Heard the applicant and objectors. The applicant Sri.DaneShom, s/o John Sakaria, Meenathethil house Panagad P.O has applied for permit to operate on the route Panagad- Manjanakkad- Chathamma via

KundannoorVyttila, Kadavanthara, Ravipuram, Ernakulam South, Menaka, High Court, Gosree bridge, Vallarpadam, Kalamukku, Murukkumpadam, Elamkunnappuzha, Manjanakkad and from Vypin to Chathamma as mofussil serviceand offered stage carriage bearing registration mark KL06D0055 which is 2005 model,condemned and replaced vehicle obviously unfit for safe and comfortable journey of passengers. The applicant has undertaken to provide a brand new vehicle satisfying AIS:052 standards with regard to the design and construction of bus body code with in the statutory period. In view of the said undertaking this authority declines to **grant** the permit to stage carriage KL06D0055 but grants regular permit in his favour provided that the applicant shall produce a stage carriage meeting the requirements of AIS:052 standard for ensuring the minimum standards of safety and comforts of passengers. Moreover the vehicle shall be of BS-VI emission standards to ensure environmental protection under rule 115 of CMVR 1989. The applicant shall modify the time schedule inconformity with the provisions of sections 91 of MV Act and 13 of Motor Transport Workers Act 1961 and Rule 188 of KMV rules. The modified time schedule shall facilitate the plying of all trips on the entire route without there being any cut trips.

#### **Item.No.5**

**07G1/6/2025/KL07**

Heard the applicant,the Chairman and Managing director, KSRTC. This is an application for grant of fresh regular stage carriage permit in respect of vehicle bearing registration mark KL159391 to operate on the route North Paravoor-Moothakunnam via KottayilKovilakam, Gothuruth, Thuruthippuram as ordinary mofussil service. Permit is **granted**.

#### **Item.No.6 J1/KL2312203T1577545/2023**

The application for grant of fresh stage carriage permiton the route Kuttungassery-Kakkanad via Njarakkal, Gosree bridge, High court, Kaloor, Palarivattom, Puthiyaroad as ordinary mofussil service has again

come up for consideration. Heard the applicant Sri. Muhammed Nishad K A, Kuruppampallathu house Edavanakkad. He has not yet offered either a particular vehicle or the particulars of any vehicle even at the time of consideration of application today. No purpose will be served by granting a stage carriage permit to a non-existent vehicle. "Suitable vehicle" offered by the applicant falls within the imagination of the applicant only. However in the view of judgement and order in WP(C) No.44904/2024 dtd.28.02.2025 of Hon'ble High Court of Kerala Permit is **granted** subject to the specified description under section 72(2) of MV Act and the following conditions.

1. The so called "suitable vehicle" offered by the applicant shall be of Type II category duly registered as such for inter urban/intercity transport as per AIS:052 standards in terms of rule 125 C of CMV rules 1989 which deals with code of practise for Bus body design and approval so as to ensure minimum standards of safety and comfort of passengers.
2. The vehicle shall be of BS-VI exhaust emission standards under rule 115 of CMV rules 1989, so as to ensure environmental protection and public safety placing reliance on judgement in WA No. 454 of 2023 (JRTO v/s Thomas Joseph) of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala.
3. The time schedule furnished by the applicant shall be modified in conformity with the provisions of sections 91 of MV Act and 13 of The Motor Transport Workers Act and rule 188 of KMV rules and settled after hearing the interested operators.

#### **Item.No.7 J1/07N1/403/2023/KL07**

The application for grant of fresh stage carriage permit on the route Ponekkara-Perumbalam Junction via Elamakkara, Kaloor, KK road, Subash Chandrabose road, Vyttila Hub, Madavana, Aroor Temple Junction and Vaduthala as ordinary mofussil service has again come up for consideration. Heard the applicant Sri. Paul Charles, S/o Charles, Lenthaparambil house North Chellanam P.O. He has not yet offered either

a particular vehicle or the particulars of any vehicle even at the time of consideration of application today. No purpose will be served by granting a stage carriage permit to a non-existent vehicle. "Suitable vehicle" offered by the applicant falls within the imagination of the applicant only. However in view of judgements and orders issued by Hon'ble High Court of Kerala, Permit is **granted** subject to the specified description under section 72(2) of MV Act and the following conditions.

1. The so called "suitable vehicle" offered by the applicant shall be of Type II category duly registered as such for inter urban/intercity transport as per AIS:052 standards in terms of rule 125 C of CMV rules 1989 which deals with code of practise for Bus body design and approval, so as to ensure minimum standards of safety and comfort of passengers.
2. The vehicle shall be of BS-VI exhaust emission standards under rule 115 of CMV rules 1989, so as to ensure environmental protection and public safety for which this authority places reliance on judgement in WA No. 454 of 2023 (JRTO v/s Thomas Joseph) of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala.
3. The time schedule furnished by the applicant shall be modified in conformity with the provisions of sections 91 of MV Act and 13 of The Motor Transport Workers Act and rule 188 of KMV rules.
4. All the trips shall be run and operated on the entire route between the termini Ponekkara and Perumbalam Junction without there being any cut trips in between.

### **Item.No.8**

**J1/07N1/393/2023/E**

Heard the applicant Smt. Prejitha P D/o Prathapan Krishnadasapuram, Ezhupunna P.O, Cherthala and objectors. This is an application for the grant of fresh regular stage carriage permit in respect of stage carriage KL02AF7099 to operate on the route Thuravoor Temple- Aster Medicity via Makkekadavu, Poochakkal, Aroor Temple, Vyttila, Edappally, Kunnumpuram, Manjummel Kavala, Edayakunnam as ordinary mofussil service.

The route applied for seeks to be terminated at Aster Medicity. But there does not exist any terminal facility for stage carriages. Bus terminus needs to be fixed and approved by the RTA or STA after consultation with certain other authorities under the provisions of Rule 207 of KMV Rules. No such terminus has been fixed Aster City Hospital for stage carriage service. Hence the matter is **adjourned** for detailed enquiry and fixation of Bus terminus at or near Aster Medicity with the consent of the hospital authorities if needed.

### **Item.No.9**

**07G1/146/2024/KL07**

The application for grant of fresh stage carriage permit on the route Aniyil beach- Edavanakkad- Vyttila Hub via Njarakkal, Gosree bridge, High court, Menaka, Kadavanthara as ordinary mofussil service has again come up for consideration. Heard the applicant Sri. Rajeev R Shenoy, RajanirmalyamNinthasthalathKuzhippilly. He has not yet offered either a particular vehicle or the particulars of any other vehicle even at the time of consideration of application today. No purpose will be served by granting a stage carriage permit to a non-existent vehicle. "Suitable vehicle" offered by the applicant falls within the imagination of the applicant only. However in the view of judgement and order in WP(C) No.44906/2024 dtd.28.02.2025 of Hon'ble High Court of Kerala. Permit is **granted** subject to the specified description under section 72(2) of MV Act and the following conditions.

1. The so called "suitable vehicle" offered by the applicant shall be of Type II category duly registered as such for inter urban/intercity transport as per AIS:052 standards in terms of rule 125 C of CMV rules 1989 which deals with code of practise for Bus body design and approval, so as to ensure minimum standards of safety and comfort of passengers.
2. The vehicle shall be of BS-VI exhaust emission standards under rule 115 of CMV rules 1989, so as to ensure environmental protection and

public safety placing reliance on judgement in WA No. 454 of 2023 (JRTO v/s Thomas Joseph) of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala.

5. The time schedule furnished by the applicant shall be modified in conformity with the provisions of sections 91 of MV Act and 13 of The Motor Transport Workers Act and rule 188 of KMV rules. The time schedule shall be settled after hearing in interested operators.

### **Item.No.10**

### **07G1/390/2024/KL07**

Heard the applicant. Sri. ShafiShereef S/o K.E Sherrefwho applied for a fresh stage carriage permit on the route Njarakkal-Vyppin-Highcourt Junction. He has offered, at the time of hearing, a vehicle bearing registration mark KL 07.BA 6179. The said vehicle is an old model vehicle, 2006- model once replaced and condemned, being unsuitable for further use as a stage carriage in the interest of public safety and comforts of passengers. It has no life span enough for being granted with a permit for 5 years. The applicant expressed his willingness and readiness to provide a much more later model vehicle complying with AIS:052 standards of bus body design and BSVI norms of exhaust emission standards within the prescribed period under Rule 159 of KMV Rules. Under the circumstances the application for fresh stage carriage permit is **granted** to such vehicle proposed by the applicant subject to the following conditions. This grant is not applicable to stage carriage KL07BA6179.

1. The so called suitable vehicle offered by the applicant shall be of Type II Category duly registered as such for inter urban/intercity transport as per AIS: 052 standards in terms of Rule 125 C of CMV Rules 1989 which deals with code of practise for Bus body design and approval, so as to ensure minimum standards of safety and comfort of passengers.



2. The vehicle shall be of BS-VI exhaust emission standards under Rule 115 of CMV Rules 1989, so as to ensure environmental protection and public safety placing reliance on judgement in WA No. 454 of 2023 (JRTO v/s Thomas Joseph) of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala.
3. The time schedule furnished by the applicant shall be modified so as to conform to the provisions of sections 91 of MV Act and 13 of the Motor Transport Workers Act and Rule 188 of KMV Rules.
4. Settlement of timings after hearing interested operators.

### **Item.No.11**

**J1/07G1/66/2024/KL07**

The application for grant of fresh stage carriage permit on the route Njarakkal -Vyttila Hub via, Gosree bridge, High court, Menaka, Kadavanthara as ordinary mofussil service has again come up for consideration. Heard the applicant Sri. Shiju VS, Valanthara house Pattanam, Vadakkekara P.O. He has not yet offered either a specific vehicle or the particulars of any vehicle even at the time of consideration of application today. No purpose will be served by granting a stage carriage permit to a non-existent vehicle. "Suitable vehicle" offered by the applicant falls within the imagination of the applicant only. However in the view of judgement and order in WP(C) No.44906/2024 dtd.28.02.2025 of Hon'ble High Court of Kerala. Permit is **granted** subject to the satisfaction of specified description under section 72(2) of MV Act and the following conditions.

1. The so called "suitable vehicle" offered by the applicant shall be of Type II category duly registered as such for inter urban/intercity transport as per AIS:052 standards in terms of rule 125 C of CMV rules 1989 which deals with code of practise for Bus body design and approval so as to ensure minimum standards of safety and comfort of passengers.

2. The vehicle shall be of BS-VI exhaust emission standards under rule 115 of CMV rules 1989, so as to ensure environmental protection and public safety placing reliance on judgement in WA No. 454 of 2023 (JRTO v/s Thomas Joseph) of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala.
3. The time schedule furnished by the applicant shall be modified in conformity with the provisions of sections 91 of MV Act and 13 of The Motor Transport Workers Act and rule 188 of KMV rules and it shall be settled after hearing the interested persons.

## **Item.No.12**

## **J1/KL240121T0089374/2024/E**

The application for grant of fresh stage carriage permit on the route Aniyil Junction- Edavanakkad- Vyttila Hub via Njarakkal, Gosree bridge, High Court, Menaka, Kadavanthara as ordinary mofussil service has again come up for consideration. Heard the applicant Sri. Siya PS, Pallekkatt house Cherai P.O he has not yet offered either a specific vehicle or the particulars of any a vehicle even at the time of consideration of application today. No purpose will be served by granting a stage carriage permit to a non-existent vehicle. "Suitable vehicle" offered by the applicant falls within the imagination of the applicant only. However in the view of judgement and order in WP(C) No.44277/2024dtd.28.02.2025 of Hon'ble High Court of Kerala. Permit is **granted** subject to the satisfaction of specified description under section 72(2) of MV Act and the following conditions.

1. The so called "suitable vehicle" offered by the applicant shall be of Type II category duly registered as such for inter urban/intercity transport as per AIS:052 in terms of rule 125 C of CMV rules 1989 which deals with code of practise for Bus body design and approval so as to ensure minimum standards of safety and comfort of passengers.

2. The vehicle shall be of BS-VI exhaust emission standards under rule 115 of CMV rules 1989, so as to ensure environmental protection and public safety for which this authority places reliance on judgement in WA No. 454 of 2023 (JRTO v/s Thomas Joseph) of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala.
3. The time schedule furnished by the applicant shall be modified in conformity with the provisions of sections 91 of MV Act and 13 of The Motor Transport Workers Act and rule 188 of KMV rules and settled after hearing the interested persons.

**Item.No.13****J1/KL240121T0089374/2024/E**

Heard the applicant. Since a portion of route applied for falls within the jurisdiction of RTA Muvattupuzha, concurrence shall be called for from that authority. The matter is **adjourned**.

**Item.No.14****07G1/67/2024/KL07**

The application for grant of fresh stage carriage permit on the route Vypinferry-Cherai-Maliyamkara-NorthParvoor-Ankamaly-Manjapra via Murukkumpadam, Valppu, Elamkunnappuzha, Kudungassery, Aniyal bazar, Kuzhuppilly, Janatha, Cherai, Kulathumkadavu, Manibazar, Maliyamkara, Moothakunnam, Andippillikavu, Munabamkalvala, North Paravoor, Fire station road, Vedimara Junction, Manjaly, Chalakka, Kuttippuzha, South Aduvassery, Chengamanad, Karakkattukunnu, Telk, Angamaly, Kidangoor, KarangalkadKappela, Manjapraas ordinary mofussil service has again come up for consideration. Heard the applicant Smt. Unnimol CS, D/o Sajeer CK Chakkanallil house South Aduvassery P.O, She has not yet offered either a specific vehicle or the particulars of a vehicle even at the time of consideration of application

today. No purpose will be served by granting a stage carriage permit to a non-existent vehicle. "Suitable vehicle" offered by the applicant falls within the imagination of the applicant only. However in the view of judgement and order in WP(C) No.44460/2024dtd.28.01.2025 of Hon'ble High Court of Kerala. Permit is **granted** subject to the specified description under section 72(2) of MV Act and the following conditions.

1. The so called "suitable vehicle" offered by the applicant shall be of Type II category duly registered as such for inter urban/intercity transport as per AIS:052 in terms of rule 125 C of CMV rules 1989 which deals with code of practise for Bus body design and approval, so as to ensure minimum standards of safety and comfort of passengers.
2. The vehicle shall be of BS-VI exhaust emission standards under rule 115 of CMV rules 1989,so as to ensure environmental protection and public safety placing reliance on judgement in WA No. 454 of 2023 (JRTO v/s Thomas Joseph) of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala.
3. The time schedule furnished by the applicant shall be modified in conformity with the provisions of sections 91 of MV Act and 13 of The Motor Transport Workers Act and rule 188 of KMV rules. Also shall be settled after hearing the interested operators.
4. All the trips shall be run and operated on the entire route between the termini Vypin ferry and Manjapraw without there being any cut trips in between.

#### **Item.No.15**

**V1/KL25053095816504/2025/E**

Heard the applicant. The application is for variation of first trip at 6:26 AM from Panagad by deviating from Palarivattom to HMT Junction via Alinchuvadu- Chembumukku- Vazhakkala- Padamukal- New boat jetty and Chitthettukara through new road Kakkanad- Seaport airport road and Thoshiba which will result in change in existing time schedule. The request for variation is not supported by any demand from the public. The proposed variation is likely to cause unnecessary delay and inconvenience to the through passengers boarding the bus to their destinations between

Palarivattom and Aluva. The report of the enquiry officer focuses on some additional facility for passengers from various places like Alinchuvadu, Vazhakkala etc. but the inconvenience caused to the direct passengers to Aluva or to the travelling public between Palrivattom and Aluvahas not been adverted to. He has also not looked with the fact that grant of any fresh stage carriage permit between Ernakulam and Aluva is impeded by various approved schemes. Further no circumstances like construction of new roads, bridges etc. detailed in rule 145(6) of KMV rules has arisen and that there is no restriction in granting new permits on the portion of the route between Palarivattom and HMT Junction as applied for.

In addition to the above it is maintained that the original route was granted taking in to account, the interest of the general public and the service has been operating without any complaint or objections. The alteration in the existing time schedule will attract serious objections and representations from the existing operators on the route. The request for deviation of the route is with a view to alter the existing time schedule so as to enrich the permit holder's commercial interests which does not fall within the domain of this authority. Therefore the application is **rejected**.

#### **Item.No.16**

**V1/KL22081243415236/2022/E**

Heard the applicant. The application is for

- (i) Renewal of permit on the route Vayalkara-Eramalloor ferry as ordinary mofussil permit which had expired on 30.09.2017.
- (ii) Variation of permit as Kizhakkambalam to Eramalloor by curtailing the route from Vayalkara to Medical College and by extension from Medical College to Kizhakkambalam.

The permit had expired on 30.09.2017 and the same was not renewed from 01.10.2017 to 30.09.2022 and from 01.10.2022 to 30.09.2027 on the ground of violation of approved scheme of nationalisation in respect of the route Aluva-Vadakumpuram. No application for variation of route avoiding the overlapping on the prohibited portion from

VedimaraParvoorNaluvazhi has been received and therefore renewal application cannot be allowed.

Examined the application for variation of permit avoiding the above said violation and seeking modification of the route by curtailment and extension. But the said variation of the permit cannot be granted in the absence of a valid permit. The applicant has also furnished a modified time schedule covering the destinations Medical College, Kizhakkambalam and Eramalloor which has invited serious objections from interested bus operators.

Having regard to the contingency emerging out of the non-renewal of permit and lack of necessity for the proposed extension of service, this authority deems it fit to consider the applications together as application for a fresh permit under the provisions of section 80 (3) of the MV Act. Therefore the time schedule shall be notified for the information of the public. Simultaneously concurrence of the RTA Muvattupuzha and Alappuzha shall be called for. **Adjourned.**

**Item.No.17**

**V2/KL23010643001070/2022/E**

Heard the applicant in detail. The variation applied for was considered by the RTA on 23.01.2023 vide item no.8 and granted the request partially so as to enable the operator to commence the first trip earlier at 6:10 AM from Thrippunithura and halt the service at Thripunithura in the evening. The appellant in MVAA No.105/2023 seeks reconsideration of his application and the Appellate Authority has ordered to consider the request on merit.

Curtailment, deviation and variation in the trips have been further examined today. The enquiry report specifically points out the inconveniences likely to occur due to the variation in the existing time schedule except in the first and last trips. Further it is pertinent to note that the original route was granted by the RTA taking into account the convenience and comforts of the travelling public in general and with the

consent of the existing permit holders on the related routes. Any change in the said time schedule and variation of the route by deviation and curtailment would adversely affect the existing facility to the travelling public and will attract serious objections from other operators as demonstrated today before us.

This authority is not satisfied about the necessity of any variation in the route by curtailment or deviation to borne out of the ulterior motive of the permit holder to enrich himself in his commercial interest. No circumstances such as change in the necessity on the existing route on account of increase or decrease in the number of permits or the necessity of any additional facility on the varied route has been noticed by this authority for granting the request of the appellant. No special circumstances such as changes in railway timings, or changes in the number of permits as laid down in rule 145 (6) or (7) of KMVR has emerged attracting the change in the route and the dislocation of the set time schedule.

Under the above circumstances the request to grant variation other than that granted by this authority on 23.01.2023 is hereby **rejected**.

**Item.No.18**

**V2/KL22082554883656/2022/E**

Heard the applicant. Permit in the respect of stage carriage KL36 a 4100 on the route Thalayolaparambu- Kaloor was saved by notification number GO (P) No: 5 /2017/Trans dtd.21.02.2017 in relation to the notified route Ernakulam- Muvattupuzha. The application is for variation of the conditions of the permit with regard to the first additional trip from Thalayolaparambu to Kaloor and curtailment of last trip from to Thalayolaparamb to Kaloor which are impermissible under clause (4) and (19) of the said approved scheme. Hence the application is **rejected**.

**Item.No.19**

**V3/e-1017689/2025/E**

Heard the applicant and other interested operators in connection with the reconsideration of the application for variation in trips in relation to the route Ezattumukham-Angamaly Airport. This authority had on 07.06.2023 considered the appellant's application and decided the matter. The appellate authority has allowed the appeal and set aside the decision and directed to consider the application afresh after causing a detailed enquiry in the matter.

Joint RTO Angamaly has enquired the matter in detail. He has reported that the proposed variation (change of trips) would be beneficial to certain areas but at the same time detrimental to the interests of the regular commuters enjoying the existing facility rendered by the service in question. The enquiry report is short of the relevant particulars laid down in rule 145 (7) of the KMVR which reads us-

*The said rule is read as*

- (i) Need for provision of additional facilities or for revision of existing timings in the interest of public;*
- (ii) Special circumstance, such as changes in railway timings, change in the number of permit either on the route or on the sectors of the route, or variation of routes:*

There is no case that the purpose of variation in timings and change in the number of trips would provide additional facilities in addition to the existing services rendered by that permit. The variation of timings is not warranted by any changes in the railway timings, the increase or decrease in the number of permits on the concerned route or sectors thereof.

This authority is satisfied that the permit holder has sought for the changes in the existing time schedule, the variation in the route and the number of trips with a view to enrich his commercial interests at the cost of the inconvenience of the travelling public. The permit was originally granted by this authority taking in to account the necessity and convenience of the passengers all along the permitted route. No change



has since emerged with regard to the travelling facilities on the route. The proposed change in times schedule is sure to entail serious objections and litigations and also result in unhealthy competition between the routes of the buses. Under the above circumstances the application for the change in timings, variation of route, and increase/decrease in the number of trips is hereby **rejected**.

**Item.No.20**

**V3/7235912019/2019/E**

Heard the applicant. The application for variation of route from Anthakaranazhi- High court junction as Pallithode- High court junction was considered by this authority on 13.12.2021 and granted the request with certain conditions. Therefore at present there is no application pending consideration in the matter of variation of permit.

The secretary RTA has not been delegated with the power to grant or reject variation of conditions of permit under rule 133 of KMVRules.

**Item.No.21**

**V4/KL25052254687112/2025/E**

Heard the applicant in detail. The existing route was varied by the RTA on 27.09.2012 so as to operate the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> trips through KK road from Kaloore to Kadavanthara. Now this applicant has sought for further variations with a view to enriching himself. The original route was granted taking into consideration of the necessity and convenience of the travelling public. No changes in the said requirements or facilities has ever occurred justifying further changes in the permit. No circumstances laid down in rule 145 (6) or (7) has since emerged warranting the variation applied for.

Further it is observed that the permit in question was saved by the approved scheme of notification G.O (P) No. 05/2017/Trans. Dated 21.02.2017, in relation to the complete exclusion scheme. The permit so saved is permitted to continue without any variation of routes. Hence the variation applied for is impermissible under law. Under the circumstances the request for further variation of route is **rejected**.

**Item.No.22****V4/KL25052625131627/2025/E**

Heard the applicant. The permitted route is West MorakkalaAluva-Thripunithurawhich was granted in the year 2005. The route was varied three times with the permission of this authority. The permit holder has again applied for variation of the route without furnishing any grounds of necessity or convenience of passengers. The permit was originally granted having regard to the necessity and convenience of the travelling public. There does not exist any necessity justifying further variation of permit. The enquiry report is also against such frequent variations of the sanctioned route. Moreover no circumstances such as construction of new roads or bridges or change in the no ofpermits on the sanctioned route as laid down in rule 145 (6) of KMV rules has since emerged. Therefore the application for variation is hereby **rejected**.

**Item.No.23****V1/KL22081293321921/2022/E**

Heard the applicant. The condition attached to the permit while granting it by RTA Ernakulam has become infructuous the moment the curtailment of route was effected on 28.10.2021 and the major portion of the route fell within the jurisdiction of the RTA Thrissur. Therefore the operation of the bus is now governed by the regulations and restrictions of RTA Thrissur.

The connected file in relation to the said permit can be transferred to the RTA Thrissur, to enable that RTA to exercisepowers under section 86 and other similar provisions.The condition imposed by this authority restraining the bus from entering Irinjalakuda bus stand will stand **deleted**.

**Item No.24****V1/KL25042203451683/2025/E**

The application for renewal is not within the prescribed time limit. No application for condoning the delay has been made before this authority. NOC from the financier or the declaration under the provisions of section 51 (6) has not been produced. Under the circumstance the application for renewal is **rejected**.

Pursuant to the order of the appellate authority the matter is considered. This saved permit does not offend any approved schemes unlike held by this authority on an earlier occasion. Renewal is **granted**.

The permit having been granted and issued in 1995 was saved under the notification GO(P) No. 42/2009 dtd. 14.07.2009 and was being renewed from time to time. There is no reason to deny the renewal of this permit whatsoever. Hence renewal is **granted**.

Admittedly this is a saved permit. The permit was granted by the RTA considering the then existing circumstances. However approved scheme GO(P) No.42/2009 dtd.14.07.2009 and the modified scheme GO(P) No. 13/23 dtd 03.05.2023 are not in operation, the latter having been set aside by the High Court. Therefore there is no reason to deny the application for renewal. Renewal is **granted**.

**RTA/KL07/DECISION/10.06.2025**

Stage carriage KL38H1422 is covered by a city permit only. The existing route. Ponekkara- Edakkochi does not offend any of the approved schemes of nationalization. The delay occurred in making the application is condoned. But the NOC required under section 51 (6) or the declaration has not been produced. Hence the matter is **adjourned** giving an opportunity to procure and produce the NOC from the financier.

**Item No.30V1/KL25050552316691/2025/E**

The application is in time. The permit originally granted in 2000 is a saved permit. The existing permit is not hit by any scheme of nationalization. Hence renewal is **granted**.

**Item No.31 V1/KL25013098423531/2024/E**

The applications is in time. The permit is a saved one. It is not hit by any approved schemes of nationalization. Hence renewal is **granted**.

**Item No.32V1/KL25012517631656/2025/E**

Delay in making the application for renewal is condoned. Unlike reported by the enquiry officer the existing route is not hit by any approved schemes of nationalisation. Hence renewal is **granted**.

**Item No.33V1/KL25040538064481/2025/E**

The parties to the joint application have not set out any tangible reasons for their desire to transfer the permit from applicant No.1 to applicant No.2. They have not furnished the copy or any other proof of the agreement entered into by them, expressing their desire to transfer the permit. They have also not furnished any statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules. Therefore the applicants are hereby required to furnish separate statements within one month so as to consider the bonafides of the proposed transfer of permit.

- i. The enquiry report is obviously short of the particulars required under rule 178 (2). The enquiry officer has no business to explore the financial stability of the proposed transferee. The enquiry report shall be with regard to the bonafides of the proposed transfer duly ensured on the basis of the agreement between the parties payment of premium, consideration etc and other circumstances. Therefore a fresh enquiry report shall be called for from a more responsible officer. Application for transfer is **adjourned**.
- ii. The renewal of permit as it stands today is **granted** since it is not hit by any approved schemes of nationalisation and since there is no other reason to deny the renewal.

**Item No.34**

**V1/KL25020659418342/2024/E**

**and**

**Supplementary item No:1**

**V1/1179370/2025/E**

Heard the applicant. Smt. RoseminJolly who is the holder of a regular stage carriage permit in respect of her vehicle no. KL40 D1557. The said permit is in relation to the route Chully- Manjaly with three trips to North Paravoor. The permit was valid up to 09.03.2015 only. Renewals of permit thereafter were kept pending consideration in view of the overlapping on the portion of the route Aluva-Vadakkumpuram (complete exclusion scheme). The vehicle has been operating on the strength of 4 months temporary permits after 2015. Vide supplementary item no. 1 the applicant has applied for variation of the route under section 80(3) the MV Act from Vedimara to Paravoor Naluvazhi via Fire Station road and Chennamangalam road junction so as to avoid objectionable overlapping on the notified route. The said variation would obviate violation of overlapping on the notified route. The application under supplementary item no. I and the other under item no 34 are mutually complementary and therefore the variation applied for under supplementary item No. I and the renewals of permit from 10.03.2015 to 09.03.2020, 10.03.2020 to 09.03.2025 and 10.03.2025 to 09.03.2030 under item no. 34 are **granted** subject to the condition that the terminus of the said route shall be refixed at Paravoor Private Bus Stand instead of Paravoor (Zero.)

**Item No.35****V1/KL7D250300002549/2025/E**

- 1) Heard the permit holder. Renewal of the existing permit is granted since there does not exist any prohibited overlapping on any notified route.
- 2) Heard the permit holder and proposed transferee Sri.Shymonk. No reasons have been setforth in the joint application for transfer of permit. The applicants have not furnished any statements under rule 178 (2) of the KMV rules. Call for the statements required by the said rule from both the applicants with adequate proof such as the agreement between the parties to prove the bonafides of the application, within one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this proceedings.

The enquiry report is not supported by any documentary evidence to prove that the proposed transferee is bonfide. It seems that the financial capacity of proposed transferee alone has weighed with the enquiry officer. He has not enquired about the premium, payment or other consideration arising out of the proposed transfer which will pass or has passed between them and the amount and nature of payment etc. as disclosed by the applicants under rule 178(2). Secretary will cause a detailed enquiry and offer his remarks on theright on the proposed transferee to operate this service in the manner authorised by the permit. Transfer application is **adjourned**.

**Item No.36****V2/ KL7D250300003350/2025/E**

Heard the applicant. It seems that the information furnished by the enquiry officer are factually incorrect worthy to be rejected only. The route in question doesnot traverse the route passing through Paravoor Kavala, Kunnumpuram, Swargam, Desom, Athani etc. Nor is there any violation of approved schemes. Renewal of permit is **granted**.

**Item No.37****V2/ KL7D250300000602/2025/E**

Heard the applicant. Application for renewal of permit is **granted** since it is not hit by any approved schemes of nationalisation.

**Item No.38**

**V2/ KL241204T4500340/2025/E**

Heard the applicant. Application for renewal is **granted** since no approved scheme of nationalisation hits the existence of the permit in question.

**Item No.39**

**V3/KL25051964306320/2025**

Heard the applicant. The renewal of permit is **granted** since the existing permit is not hit by any approved schemes of nationalisation.

**Item No.40**

**V3/e-997288/2025-E**

Heard the applicant. Sr. Anas MR.The permit in respect of vehicle no KL07AR5419 had expired way back on 17.11.2023. The route bus KL07AR5419 having attained the age of 20 years had become out modelled on 26.04.2024 Replacement application was filed on 19.07.2024 by which time the incoming vehicle had attained the age of 18 years. The said vehicle is an old junk, condemned and replaced one being unfit for further use. The suitability of vehicle has to be ensured by a team of inspectors with particular stress on AIS: 052 standards to ensure the minimum standards of safety and comforts of passengers and the exhaust emission standards.

However renewal of permit is **granted**. Replacement will be considered in the next meeting of this authority, of course, on receipt of the inspection report as suggested above.

**Item No.41**

**V3/e-1177483/2025-E**

Heard the permit holder. Bus KL04M6135 is permitted to ply on the route Eramalloor-Eramalloor(circular service). The matters that have come up for consideration are renewal of permit, transfer of permit, replacement of vehicle and grant of temporary permit.

On a conspectus of all relevant facts and circumstances, it is discernible that the then RTA happened to involve itself in unlawful acts and omissions at the instance of the permit holder and two other persons namely BensherShajiath and Basheer, not knowing what is what and who the persons were behind the applications or representations on various counts. The intrigues played by the permit holder and other persons have not been noticed by the RTA. Now it has become necessary for this authority to traverse on the entire matrix with a view to elicit the facts and circumstances so as to dispose of each and every application or representation deserving consideration.

Sri. Abdulkalam the permit holder has held a permit valid up to 12.07.2016 in respect of his vehicle KL04M6535. The belated application for renewal of the permit was adjourned by the RTA for reasons on 23.02.2017, simultaneously permitting inadvertently the transfer of permit in favour of Sri. BensheerShajiath the proposed transferee. The RTA ought not have granted the transfer of permit in the absence of a permit in existence. The permit holder and the proposed transferee failed to produce current records of the vehicle and avail of the transfer of permit granted by the authority.

The RTA on 17.05.2017 granted renewal of permit with direction to produce current records, but in vain. After the lapse of three months of the expiry of the statutory period, the permit holder sought for further extension of time for four months period from 23.09.2017 for production of current records. The said application was not competent. But the RTA happened to inadvertently allow the extension by another four months. The permit holder did not comply with the provisions of rule 159(2) and hence show cause notice was issued for revocation of the grant of renewal as well as the permission to transfer the permit only to be disregarded by the applicant till 30.08.2024 on which date he surfaced himself with an application for renewal of permit for a further period of five years in continuation of the earlier grant which in fact was not availed of by him. In view of these facts and circumstances this authority feels that it is just



and proper to revoke the permission dated 23.02.2017 for transfer of permit and grant of renewal of permit dtd.17.05.2017 and accordingly hereby **revoke the permission for transfer of permit and the grant of renewal of permit.**

All the subsequent events like application for replacement of vehicle by another bus on 11.06.2024, application made by BensheerShajitath on 10.06.2024, another application for renewal of permit on 21.08.2024, application for condonation of delay on 29.05.2025, personal hearing on 23.05.2025, application for temporary permits, request to withdraw the renewal application by Sri. BensherShajiath, application by Mr. Basheer etc are all found to be unnecessary and incompetent under law especially in the absence of a valid permit and a suitable vehicle. Various orders and directions of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala were promptly acted upon without fail. Admittedly a registered owner of bus KL08AE5454, like any other citizen is competent to apply for and obtain temporary permit under the provisions of section 87(1)(c) of the Act.

The whole exercises were practiced with a view to carry on the trade in buying and selling permits with the sole motive of unlawful and disproportionate gains which could be termed as trafficking in permit. In the absence of a valid permit in favour of the original permit holder no action under section 86 (1) of the MV Act or under other penal provisions is deemed necessary at this point of time.

### **Item No.42V3/ KL25031734923805/2025**

There is inordinate delay in making the application for renewal of permit. The permit was valid up to 27.01.2025. Application was made only on 17.03.2025. The medical certificate would not justify the delay in making the application for renewal of the permit. The vehicle was admittedly in use without renewing the permit even if the permit holder was undergoing treatment of some sort. NOC from the financier has also not been produced from HDFC BANK Cochin- 17. Five cases of Challans are pending disposal which stands against the grant of renewal of permit.

The conduct of the permit holder as an operator of stage carriage is found not satisfactory. Under the circumstance the application for renewal is **rejected**.

**Item No.43** **V3/ KL25053035897126/2025**

Delay condoned. Renewal **granted.**

**Item No.44** **V3/KL25051433654675/2025**

The overlapping on Kottayam-Neendoor route covered by complete exclusion scheme no forbids the grant or renewal of permit. Hence the consideration of the application is **deferred** until the next meeting of this authority. In the meantime the secretary will make an enquiry as to the violation on approved scheme dealt within the available report of enquiry.

**Item No.45V3/KL25060236128783/2025**

Two applications for renewal of permit in succession are **granted** since the route Teekoy-Kaloor is not hit by any of the schemes mentioned in the enquiry report.

**Item No.46** **V3/ KL25012277235040/2025**

The decision of the application is **deferred** till the next meeting on the following grounds

- i) The enquiry report is silent on the production of NOC from the financier
- ii) e-challans alleging commitment of 114 offences are pending clearance

**Item No.47** **V3/KL24022907269841/2025**

The renewal of permit from 04.012014 has been hanging fire for reasons of offending the approved nationalisation scheme. This authority has examined the detailed report made by the RTO Ernakulam which has been accepted in principle for consideration and disposal of certain pending applications.

The decision on the renewals of permits for 3 successive periods of five years each are deferred until the permit holder prefers an application for deviation of route and change in terminus if he so desires. **Adjourned.**

**Item No.48**

**V3/KL23040595270036/2025-E**

The death of the permit holder P K Kumaran on 30.08.2020 was not intimated within the prescribed period by the person succeeding to the procession of the vehicle. The non-operation or withdrawal of service from 30.11.2020 was also not notified to the RTA. So there is reason to believe that the so called successor has used the vehicle to operate stage carriage service till the validity of the permit on 16.04.2023. Even after the expiry of the permit the vehicle was operated without permit till date, without any right being conferred on the successor to use the vehicle in the manner authorised by the permit. Under these circumstances it is resolved that the so called successor has no right to seek the renewal of permit until after the permit was transferred in to his name. Therefore the application for renewal of permit is **rejected**. Consequently the transfer of permit applied for cannot be considered on the ground that there does not exist any valid permit.

The application for transfer of permit can be treated as an application for fresh permit under rule 178 (4) of the Kerala rules if applied for by the applicant along with the prescribed fee. The matter will be considered in the next meeting of this authority.

**Item No.49**

**V3/KL25051283288713/2025**

Delay is condoned. Renewal of permit is **granted**.

**Item No.50**

**V4/KL25031424578865/2025/E**

Renewal **granted**. Subject to payment of Govt. dues and clearance of pending challans.

**Item No.51**

**V4/KL24120407427054/2024/E**

Renewal of permit is **granted**.

**Item No.52 V4/KL25011586156816/2025/E**

Since there no violation of any approved schemes of nationalisation renewal is **granted**.

**Item No.53 V4/KL25020338864821/2025/E**

There is inordinate delay of 21 days in making the application for renewal of permit. No cogent reason has been put forth for justifying the said delay. Admittedly the applicant has operated the vehicle without permit. Moreover 186 e-challans are pending disposal. The conduct of the applicant as the holder of a stage carriage permit is not satisfactory inasmuch he appears to have exercised no effective supervision or guidance in the conduct of the bus. Service hence the application for renewal is **rejected**.

**Item No.54 V4/KL25042991475522/2025/E**

The delay is condoned in view of the medical certificate dt.27.04.2025 produced Renewal is **granted** ignoring the irrelevant and improper report of enquiry by the secretary RTA.

**Item No.55 V4/KL24020196200494/2024/E**

Delay has already been condoned. The applicant has not applied for any variation with a view to avoid objectionable overlapping. The secretary will cause an enquiry and specifically report whether the existing route would connect or pass through the intermediate points Paravoor and Mannam of the notified Route Aluva-Charai. Matter is **adjourned**.

**Item No.56 V4/KL241215T5945296/2024/E**

Since the existing route Vyttila Hub-N Paravoor is not hit by any approved scheme of nationalisation renewal of permit is **granted** deprecating the improper and irregular report of enquiry.

**Item No.57****V1/982735/2024/E**

Issue show cause notice as to why the grant of renewal dtd17.08.2024 should not be revoked.The second application dtd. 16.12.2024 for renewal from 22.07.2024 to 21.07.2029 is inordinately delayed by 161 days and the vehicle has defaulted service from. 01.11.2019. The vehicle is not covered by up to date payment of tax, certificate of fitness etc. The second application so made on 16.12.2024 is **rejected** since there is no vehicle covered by a valid permit.

**Item No.58****V2/ KL17d23030000414/2023/E**

Heard the applicant. The application is for transfer of permit from the name of deceased permit holder to the legal successor and also for renewal of permit. The successor is entitled to prosecute the renewal application. Both the applications were filed within the specified time limit. Therefore both the applications for renewal and transfer of permit are **granted**.

**Item No.59****V1/KL25031194057001/2025/E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL13S0015 by the applicant No.1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in the name of applicant No. 2

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2)of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no

tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

#### **Item No.60**

#### **V1/KL25010194125974/2025/E**

Heard the permit holder. Smt. Neenu Samsudeen and the proposed transferee Sri. Anshas EA. This is an application for transfer of permit in respect of stage carriage KL07CD0108 operating on the route Kakkanad-Fortkochi from the name Smt. Neenu Samsudeen to Sri. Anshas E A. No tangible reasons have been set forth in the joint application except the financial difficulty/lack of personal management on the part of the permit holder. The second applicant has agreed to purchase the said vehicle and continue to ply the vehicle on the existing route if only the permit is transferred into his name. The applicants have not submitted separate statements required under rule 178(2) of KMV Rules. The agreement of contract executed between the permit holder and Sri Anshas EA has not been made available for examination by the enquiry officer for consideration by the RTA. The financial stability of the proposed

transferee alone has been explored under rule 178 (7) which would not necessarily qualify the transferee to hold stage carriage permit

Stage carriage permits are granted and issued to citizens after elaborate process and procedures under sections 70,71,72,80 and a rule 145 of KMV rules with a view to subserve the interests of the travelling public. Permits are granted not for promoting trade in buying and selling permits with the motive of making profit by anybody. The permit holder seems to take undue advantage of his position as the holder of permit which attracts the stigma of trafficking in permit.

A stage carriage permit issued under the MV Act is not transferable except under the context of death of permit holder. Emergence of situations such as permanent disability, desire to transfer to inheritants or near relations out of love and affection can also be considered as sufficient grounds for transfer of permit. There is every reason to believe that the proposed transfer is not bonafide. The first applicant Smt. Neenu Samsudeen and the second applicant Sri. Anshas EA have jointly engaged themselves in trafficking in permit. This view of the matter is supported by the conduct of the second applicant Sri Anshas in making, inter alia, a similar application in item No. 71 of this agenda whereby the permit respect of another bus KLCG3976 plying on the route Chottanikkara – Fort Kochi is sought to be transferred in his favour from Sri. Faisal the permit holder without any bonafide reasons. The transferor is also an aspirant of disproportionate and unreasonable gains arising out of the proposed transfer of permit. Since it is a clear case of trafficking in permit, the application for transfer of permit is **rejected**.

### **Item No.61V1/KL25052975581809/2025/E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL11AA0189 by applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal**

**management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in to the name of applicant No. 2

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

**Item No.62V1/KL25052224642903/2025/E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL07BB0304 by

**RTA/KL07/DECISION/10.06.2025**



the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in to the name of applicant No. 2

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

**Item No.63**

**V1/KL25053075760487/2025/E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicant appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL42L1251 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in the name of applicant No. 2

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

**Item No.64****V1/KL24030209631898/2024/E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicant appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL41A1251 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in the name of applicant No. 2

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available

records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

### **Item No.65V1/KL24051006388863/2024/E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL65C1572 by applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in to the name of applicant No. 2

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the

transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

### **Item No.66**

**V1/KL25052985582010/2025/E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL38H1424 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in to the name of applicant No. 2

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to

hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

### **Item No.67**

**V1/KL25053045760981/2025/E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL06E1435 by applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** into the name of applicant No. 2.

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit.

The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

**Item No.68**

**V1/KL25052935722568/2024/E**

Heard the applicants. This is an application for transfer of permit from the deceased permitholder Sri. Paraman in favour of his daughter Smt. Akhila. The application has been processed. But the renewal of permit has not been granted by the RTA for reason of violation of the approved schemes of nationalisation. An enquiry is deemed necessary for granting renewal of permit with modification of the route by curtailment or deviation as the case may be subject to the consent and application by the legal heir. Hence **adjourned**.

The successor is entitled to temporary permit under section 87(1) (D) of MV act. Since the application for renewal is pending consideration. Hence temporary permit is **granted**.

**Item No.69**

**V1/KL25031995242345/2025/E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicant appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL441541 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to certain inconveniences”**

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on

emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

### **Item No.70**

**V1/990552/2025/E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL35J2497 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in to the name of applicant No. 2.

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle but the existing permit is not transferable save under exceptionable



circumstance laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence similar circumstances like permanent disability of the permit holder, inherital transfer or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection etc. No such circumstances have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for transfer of permit.

Besides the existing permit on the route Vattappara- Kaloor is a saved permit under the approved scheme of nationalization relating the route Ernakulam – Muvattupuzha GO(P)No:5/17/tran.dt.21.02.2017. Clause (4) of the said scheme forbids the grant of variation and transfer of permit in favour of any other person. Therefore the transfer applied for is incompetent and hence **rejected**.

**Item No.71V2/ KL7D250500002928/2025/E**

Heard the permit holder. Sri.Faisal and the proposed transferee Sri.Anshas EA. This is an application for transfer of permit in respect of stage carriage KL07CG3976 operating on the route Chottanikkara-Fortkochi from the name former to the latter. No tangible reasons have been set forth in the joint application except the financial difficulty/lack of personal management on the part of the permit holder. The second applicant has agreed to purchase the said vehicle and continue to ply the vehicle on the existing route. That is also no ground for transfer of permit. The applicants have not submitted separate statements required under rule 178(2) of KMV Rules. The agreement of contract executed between the permit holder and Sri Anshas EA has not been made available for examination by the enquiry officer or the RTA with a view to ensure the bonafides or otherwise of the proposed transfer. The financial stability of the proposed transferee alone has been reported under rule 178 (7) which would not weigh with this authority while considering the application.

Stage carriage permits are granted and issued to citizens after elaborate process and procedures under section 70,71,72,80 and a rule 145 of KMV

rules with a view to sub serve the interests of the travelling public. Permits are granted not for promoting trade in buying and selling permits with the motive of making profit by taking undue advantage of the position of holder permit which attracts the stigma of trafficking in permit.

A stage carriage permit issued under the MV Act is not transferable except under the context of death of permit holder emergence of situations such a permanent disability, desire to transfer to inheritants or near relations out of love and affection can also be considered as sufficient grounds for transfer of permit. There is every reason to believe that the proposed transfer is not bonafide. The first applicant Sri. Faizal PI and the second applicant Sri. Anshas EA have jointly engaged themselves in trafficking in permit. This view of the matter is supported by the conduct of the second applicant Sri Anshas in making a similar application in item No. 60 of this agenda whereby the permit respect of another bus KL07CD0108 plying on the route Kakkanad – Fortkochi is sought to be transferred in his favour from Sri.Faisal the permit holder without any bonafide reasons. The transferor is also an aspirant of disproportionate and unlawful gains arising out of the proposed transfer of permit. Since it is a clear case of trafficking in permit the application for transfer of permit is **rejected**.

## **Item No.72**

**V2/KL7D250500003082 /2025/E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL343668 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in to the name of applicant No. 2

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on

emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

### **Item No.73V2/ KL7D250500002908/2025/E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL18F4488 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to certain inconveniences”**.

The existing permit is not transferable save under exceptionable circumstance laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence similar circumstances like permanent disability of the permit holder, inherital transfer or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection etc. No such circumstances have been set forth in the joint application.

The inconveniences of the permit holder is not a ground for effecting transfer of permit conferring the right to operate the service on by any person other than the permit holder.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters required therein duly supported by necessary agreement of contract. In the absence such statements the enquiry contemplated under rule 178 (7) seems to be impossible to elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the applicant No 2 are no valid grounds for permitting the transfer of permit. Nor will it alone qualify the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. This authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer of permit and hence the application is **rejected**.

#### **Item No.74V2/KL7D250500003087 /2025/E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL07AX4309 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in to the name of applicant No. 2

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

#### **Item No.75**

**V2/KL7D250500003209/2025/E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL32A 2719 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in to the name of applicant No. 2

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no

tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

#### **Item No.76**

**V2/ KL7D250500002929/2025/E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL332530 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to certain inconveniences”**.

The existing permit is not transferable save under exceptionable circumstance laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, inherital transfer or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection etc. No such circumstances have been set forth in the joint application. The inconveniences of the permit holder is no ground for effecting transfer of permit conferring the right to operate the service on any person other than the permit holder.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters required therein duly supported by necessary agreement of contract. In the absence such statements and the agreement of contract the enquiry contemplated under rule 178 (7) seems to be impossible to elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the applicant No 2 are no valid grounds for permitting the transfer of permit. Nor will it alone qualify the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. This authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer of permit and hence the application is **rejected.**

### **Item No.77**

### **V2/ KL7D250500002930/2025/E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL11 AX3377 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in to the name of applicant No. 2

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly

accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

#### **Item No.78**

**V2/ KL7d250500003064/2025/E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL33D2945 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in to the name of applicant No. 2.

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle but the existing permit is not transferable save under exceptionable circumstance laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar circumstances like permanent disability of the permit holder, inherital transfer or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection etc. No such circumstances have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for transfer of permit. This authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer of permit.



Besides the existing permit in relation to the route Mulakkulam- Kaloor is a saved permit by virtue of an approved scheme of the nationalization vide GO (P) No:5/17/tran.dt 21.02.2017. Clause (4) of the said scheme forbids the grant of any variation of permits in favour of any other person. Therefore the application for transfer of permit is not complicated and hence the hence **rejected**.

**Item No.79**

**V2/KL7D250500002104 /2025/E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL17X3393 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in the name of applicant No. 2.

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle but the existing permit is not transferable save under exceptionable circumstance laid down under section 82 (1) of the Act or on emergence similar circumstances like permanent disability of the permit holder, inherital transfer or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection etc. No such circumstances have been set forth in the joint application.

Besides the existing permit in relation to the route Mulakkulam- Kaloor is a saved permit by virtue of an approved scheme of the nationalization vide GO (P) No:5/17/tran.dt 21.02.2017. Clause (4) of the said scheme forbids the grant of any variation of permits in favour of any other person. Therefore the application for transfer of permit is not complicated and hence the hence **rejected**.

**Item No.80**

**V2/KL7D250500003088/2025/E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL39N3222 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal**

**management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in to the name of applicant No. 2

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

**Item No.81**

**V2/KL7D250500003083/2025/E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL40M3070 by the applicant No.1 **“due to certain inconveniences”**

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

**Item No.82**

**V2/ KL24121942401046 /2024/E**

Heard the applicants. Reconsidered the matter. The decision of this authority dated 18.01.2025 rejecting the application for transfer of permit was based on an erroneous consideration of the destination “Chottanikkara” instead of “Chittetthukara” which was an inadvertent omission and error of in facts which necessitated reconsideration in the interest of justice. Therefore the decision dated 18.01.2025 needs modification to the extent that the route does not offend any approved scheme of nationalisation and therefore the application for transfer of permit is **permitted**.

### **Item No.83**

### **V3/KL25022121452238/2025-E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL07BG5631 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in to the name of applicant No. 2

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such

statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

**Item No.84**

**V3/KL25031314559899/2025-E**

Heard the applicants Sri. KK Sukumaran and Sri. Sukumar T respectively the first and second applicants. The application is for transfer of permit in respect of stage carriage vehicle KL05U6768 permitted to ply on the route Edakkochi-Fort Kochi from the name of the permit holder to his son obviously for reasons borne out of love and affection leaving no rooms for trafficking in permit the involvement of unscrupulous touts or agents in the affairs of making application, causing enquiries and processing of applications is discernible from the respective documents on record which is only to be deprecated.

This authority is satisfied that the transfer of permit applied for is bonafidee and hence **permitted**.

**Item No.85**

**V3/ KL24102463031895/2025-E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL06D5341 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in to the name of applicant No. 2

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

**Item No.86**

**V3/KL25051383478183 /2025-E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL07BB6559 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit**

**RTA/KL07/DECISION/10.06.2025**

**to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in to the name of applicant No. 2

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

**Item No.87**

**V3/KL25040798328398/2025-E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL58D7360 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in to the name of applicant No. 2

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.



**Item No.88****V3/KL25041579475782/2025/E**

Heard the applicant. Sri. Anosh VM. He has applied for the transfer of permit in respect of stage carriage KL39B5352 permitted to operate on the route Kumbalanghi-South Chittoor in his favour consequent to the death of his father Mohanan who was the holder of the permit. The applicant is the legal successor competent to seek the transfer of permit in his favour. Considered the intimation of death of permit holder and connected documents relating to legal heirship etc. The application for the transfer of permit is **permitted**.

**Item No.89****V3/KL25032836771657/2025-E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL07BG6148 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in the name of applicant No. 2

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly

accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

#### **Item No.90**

#### **V3/E-1001554 /2025-E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL16J5385 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in to the name of applicant No. 2

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

### **Item No.91**

### **V3/KL25032876769842/2025-E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL07BB5347 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in to the name of applicant No. 2

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no

tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

#### **Item No. 92**

**V3/KL24111126545440/2024-E**

Head the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicant appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL07BE5945 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in the name of

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no

tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

### **Item No.93**

**V3/ KL25052965695753 /2025-E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicant appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL42C5174 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in the name of applicant No. 2.

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint

application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

#### **Item No.94**

**V3/ KL25052114488154/2025-E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicant appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL18E6390 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in the name of applicant No. 2.

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint

application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

#### **Item No.95**

**V3/ KL25020639371876 /2025-E**

The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL416364 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in to the name of applicant No. 2.

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint

application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

#### **Item No.96**

**V4/KL25052735350922/2025/E**

The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL17M9091 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in to the name of applicant No. 2.

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle but the existing permit is not transferable save under exceptionable circumstance laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar circumstances like permanent disability of the permit holder, inherital transfer or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection etc. No such circumstances have been set forth in the joint application.



Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are tangible reasons for transfer of permit.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters required therein duly supported by necessary agreement of contract. In the absence such statements the enquiry contemplated under rule 178 (7) seems to be impossible to elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the applicant No 2 are no valid grounds for permitting the transfer of permit. This authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the application.

Besides the existing permit in relation to the route Koothattululam- Kaloor is a saved permit by virtue of an approved scheme notified in GO (P) No: 5/2017/tran.dt.21.02.2017. Clause(4) of the said scheme does not allow transfer of permit in favour of the another person and therefore the application for transfer of permit is not competent. Hence **rejected**.

## **Item No.97**

**V4/990049/2025/E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL13X9639 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in to the name of applicant No. 2

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit

holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

#### **Item No.98**

**V4/985485/2024/E**

Heard the applicants. Sri. Jeeva George and MD George. The application is for transfer of permit in respect of stage carriage No. KL35H9253 permitted to operate on the route Ernakulam – Piravam. This is a saved permit under the provisions of the approved scheme relating to Ernakulam- Muvattupuzha route (complete exclusion vide GO(P) No:5/2017/ tran.dt.21.02.2020). The said bus has been permitted to overlap the notified route from Vyttila – Thiruvankulam by virtue of the provisions of the said scheme. Clause (4) of this scheme prohibits transfer of the permit so saved in favour of any other person. Therefore transfer of permit is impermissible and hence **rejected**.

**Item No.99****V4/1111098/2025/E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL07BF7586 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in to the name of applicant No. 2

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not

satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

### **Item No.100**

**V4/KL24080952362235/2024/E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL07BJ9452 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in to the name of applicant No. 2

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section

(3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

**Item No.101**

**V4/KL25011335885046/2025/E**

Heard the applicants. The application is for transfer of permit in respect of stage carriage bearing registration mark KL 57 9394. The permit has been renewed up to 14.01.2030. The application for transfer of permit is considered on merit

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of

sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

### **Item No.102V4/KL25051884142969/2025 /E**

Heard the applicant. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL07DA8365 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in to the name of applicant No. 2

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed

transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

### **Item No.103**

**V4/KL25051884137665/2025 /E**

Heard the applicant. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL41A7983 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in to the name of applicant No. 2

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help

elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

#### **Item No.104**

**V4/KL25051894132753/2025 /E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL7BS7623 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in the name of applicant No. 2

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which



is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

#### **Item No.105**

**V4/KL25051864134686/2025 /E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL07BH7650 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in to the name of applicant No. 2

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

### Item No.106

**V4/KL24070618000381/2024/E**

Heard the applicant. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL07BD9114 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in to the name of applicant No. 2

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no

tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

#### **Item No.107**

**V4/KL25012297199981/2025/E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL58P9671 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in to the name of applicant No. 2

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love

and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

#### **Item No.108**

**V4/KL25060226215363/2025/E**

Heard the applicants. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL428943 by the applicant No. 1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in to the name of applicant No. 2

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle. Transfer of permit is not a condition precedent for the transfer of ownership of the bus. The existing permit is not transferable, save under exceptional circumstances laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on

emergence of similar exigencies like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection, etc. No such circumstances, have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no tangible reasons for granting the transfer of permit. It would only attract the provisions of Rule 217 of KMV Rules.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters specified therein duly accompanied by an anterior and enforceable agreement of contract which is a material particular required under sub rule (3). In the absence of such statements, the enquiry contemplated under Rule 178(7) would not help elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the proposed transferee are no germane considerations for qualifying the transferee to hold a stage carriage permit. Matters referred to in clauses (d) and (f) of sub section (1) of section 70 and sub clause (ii) of clause (d) of sub section (3) of section 71 are material particulars that shall weigh with the transport authority while considering the qualifications of a person to hold a permit. On the basis of the information gathered and the available records such as joint application, statements etc. this authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the proposed transfer and hence the application is **rejected**.

**Item No.109**

**07G1/8/2025-KL07**

Concurrence is **granted**.

**Item No.110**

**07G1/67/2025-KL07**

Concurrence is **granted**.

**Item No.111**

**07G1/3/2025-KL07**

Concurrence is **granted**.

**Item No.112**

**V1/KL24080832143449/2025/E**

**RTA/KL07/DECISION/10.06.2025**

Heard the applicant. This authority had granted renewal of permit in respect of the applicant's vehicle No. KL17 B0635 on 17.08.2024. But the permit holder was not able to produce the current records within the specified period owing to the fact that the original route bus had become out modelled. But the permit holder had by the time applied for replacement of the said vehicle by another vehicle bearing registration number KL401026 which satisfied the requirements of Rule 174 of the KMV rules. Unless and until replacement is granted and effected the renewal of permit cannot be duly endorsed in the permit. With a view to get over this contingency replacement is **sanctioned**.

**Item No.113**

**V2/ /2025/E**

Heard the applicant. This is an application for replacement by stage carriage KL 35A5277 which conforms to the provisions of rule 174 of KMV rules. The existing route bus KL17B3648 has become out modelled on 08.11.2024. The application for replacement was made on 15.04.2025. There is no objection in granting the replacement even after expiry of the life span of the original route bus so long as the permit is valid up to 03.05.2027. Hence replacement is **sanctioned**.

The secretary RTA will issue showcause notice for suspension or cancellation of permit under section 86 (1) of the MV Act and recover a sum of money under rule 186 of KMV rules if there is a case of operation of bus KL17 B 3648 after its life span.

**Item No. 114**

**V2/KL58D4720/2025/E**

This is a case where departmental action against the permit holders of buses KL58D4720 and KL07BD9077 and against the drivers and contractors is sought for by a complainant Smt. Vijayalakshmi S who sustained grievous hurt while travelling in one of the buses. The complainant has alleged unhealthy competition between the two buses all along a long distance often will fully hitting each other and racing one behind the other and causing inconvenience to passengers as well as other road users.

It has been reported that a criminal case has been registered by Hill palace police for dangerous driving and other offences. The report of enquiry by the Joint RTO Tripunithura has affirmed the allegations against to the bus crew. Show cautions notices were issued to the permit holders for failure to exercise effective supervision and control over the working of his employees so as to ensure the operation of vehicles in conformity with the provisions of MV Act and Rules. The permit holders have not submitted any explanations or appeared before the secretary RTA for being heard in person.

It is under the above circumstances that the matter has been brought before this authority for departmental action contemplated under section 86 (1) of the MV Act under notice to the concerned. However Sri.Joshy VR, Varuparambil house, Thiruvankulam holder of the permit had appeared before this authority today and submitted his explanation in writing. The accused person has denied the charges levelled against him and explained that his bus was hit from behind by bus KL07BD9077 which was plying disregarding the traffic rules and regulations.

Examined his statement in detail and found that the explanation offered is not satisfactory and hence it is resolved to **suspend** the regular permit in respect of bus KL58D4720 for a period of 30 days from 15.09.2025

Since stage carriage permit KL07BD9077 was covered by a temporary permit only. **Prosecution steps** shall be initiated by the joint RTO Tripunithura against the registered owner of the said bus for offences committed under rules 153 (2) and (3) of KMV rules. No further temporary permit shall be granted in favour of bus KL07BD9077 for a period of 30 days on expiry of existing temporary permit as on today since the temporary permit holder was equally responsible if not more, for the occurrence on 24.04.2025. Prosecution shall also be launched against the conductors of the both buses for having performed the duties of conductors without license. The result of the prosecution shall be reported to this authority within 3 months.

**Item No. 115****V3/E-1120891/2025/E**

This is a case where departmental action against the permit holders of the bus KL07BF6693 and KL07BF1621 and against the drivers and conductors is sought for. It has been reported that altercation between the crew of bus No: KL07BF6693 and another bus KL07 BF 1621 had taken place at Edappally bus stop. The matter was reported to Elamakkara police station and the police have taken steps to investigate and charge sheet cases against the concerned crew.

The Motor Vehicles Department have initiated departmental action against concerned including the permit holders on the basis of FIR and reports in various medias. Being satisfied of the misconduct and altercations on the part of the employees of the buses show cause notices were issued to the concerned as to why the permits of the buses should not be suspended under section 86(1) of the MV Act for violation of conditions of permit as laid down in rule 153 (2) and (3) of the KMV rules.

The permit holder of stage carriage KL07BF1621 has submitted his statement of defence denying the charges against him at the time of hearing. The permit holder of bus KL07BF6693 was heard in person by this authority though he has not submitted any explanation in writing. The explanations so offered in writing or in person as the case may be were examined in detail and found that both the explanations were not satisfactory. This authority is satisfied that both the permit holders have violated conditions of the permit contemplated in rule 153 of KMV rules and that they failed to exercise effective supervision and control over the working of their employees so as to ensure that the bus service was conducted in conformity with the provisions of MV Act and Rules.

Under the above circumstances this authority resolves to **suspend** the respective permits of the permit holders of buses KL07BF6693 and KL07BF1621 for a period of 1 month each with effect from



15.09.2025. The secretary shall enforce the suspension of permit and report the compliance within 3 months.

**Item No. 116**

**V4/117810/2025/E**

This is case where stage carriage bearing registration mark KL13U8082 involved in an accident causing death of a pillion rider of a motor cycle bearing registration mark KL43L1802 on 14.03.2025 at 2:45 PM. Occurrence took place near Penta MenakaErnakulam. The police have registered a FIR vide crime No.351/2025at Central Police station Ernakulam. They have requested for the cancellation of the permit by this authority.

Show cause notice was issued to the permit holder as to why the permit of the stage carriage should not be cancelled or suspended for violation of the conditions relating to the duties and responsibilities of the permit holder under rule 153 of KMV rules read with section 86 (1) of MV Act. No reply received but he appear before this authority and denied the charges against him. This authority is satisfied that the conduct of Sri. Anooj TA as holder of the permit was not satisfactory in as much as he had committed offence for which more than 100 e-challans have been issued which pending disposal. He has also indulged in the process of transferring the permit in favour of another person even without clearing the pending e-challans.

He has also not exercised due care and diligence in employing persons with unblemished character and conduct. His driver Sri. Anoob PJ S/o Jamal PA is an accused person under various provisions of NDPS act, IPC,KP act, MV Act etc.

This authority having regard to the aforesaid facts and circumstances hereby resolve to **suspend** the permit in respect of stage carriage bearing registration mark KL13U8082 for a period of 3 months from 15.09.2025.

**Item No. 117****V4/KL25060286191235/E**

Heard the applicant. This is a case of replacement of stage carriage bearing registration mark KL 17 B 8686 covered by a city permit valid up to 09.05.2027 by another stage carriage KL 33 B 3538. The incoming vehicle is 2010 model vehicle conforming to the provisions of Rule, 174 of KMV rules. But the said vehicle is different from the original route bus in material particulars in as much as such particulars are in excess of 25 %. Hence the application for replacement is **rejected**.

**Item No. 118****07N1/155/2023-KL07**

It has been noticed by this authority that a number of regular stage carriage permit were granted to persons other than STU for operation on a portion of notified route Aluva-Vadakkumpuram there by offending the provisions of approved scheme, of course taking into account the then existing travelling requirement. The renewal of such permits has been pending consideration since a long time. In the absence of appropriate decision by the State Govt. on various representations from the public this authority caused a detailed enquiry through the secretary of RTA to examine the feasibility of renewing and the retaining such permits in view of the public convenience. The secretary RTA Ernakulam submitted a report on 04.06.2025 pursuant to the decision of RTA dated 17.08.2024.

In the light of the aforesaid report of the secretary the following decisions are taken by this authority.

1. The violation of the provisions of the approved scheme No. 27106-TA2/PW dtd.17.06.1965 in relation to Aluva-Vadakkumpuram by overlapping on the portion of the route from Mannam to ParavoorNaluvazhi for a distance of 1.75 Km can be obviated by variation of the private service permit from Vedimara to ParavoorNaluvazhi through Fire station road. The said variation will result in the reduction of common portion of operation to 70 meters only which will not amount to overlapping on the notified route but only an inevitable intersection of the notified route from

Chennamangalam road junction to ParavoorNaluvazhi, admittedly not in the same line of travel of STU services. Such intersection will not hit the said approved scheme. This authority may be able to consider applications for variation of the existing routes. If preferred by the concerned private operators.

2. In the case of permits connecting the intermediate points Mannam and Paravoor(Zero) there by offending the approved scheme No.65598/TA4/60/PWdtd.28.08.1961 and overlapping on the notified route Aluva- Cherai from Vedimara to Paravoor(Zero) can be renewed and retained by variation mentioned in Item No. 1 above and also a change in the terminus from Paravoor Zero to Paravoor private bus stand.
3. The operators of the services destined to Gothuruth, KottayilKovilakametc which at present overlaps the notified route (complete exclusion scheme Aluva-Vadakkumpuram) can seek variation of their routes from Paravoor Municipal Junction toGothurth, KottayilKovilakam etc. via Parayakkadu, KoottukadKettida, Subramanya Temple, Chalippalam and cutting across the notified route Aluva – vadakumpuram without any objectionable overlapping.
4. The operation of private stage carriage service from Aluva- Paravoor Kavala will not offend the complete exclusion scheme in relation to the notifiedroute Aluva- Vadakkumpuram in view of the protanto notifications approved after 1965.

### **Item No. 119**

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

### **Item No.120**

**07G1/125/2025/KL07**

Decision deferred.

**Supplementary Item No:01                      V1/1179370/2025/E**

The application under supplementary item no. I and the other under item No 34 are mutually complementary and therefore the decision taken under item No.34 is applicable in this item also.

**Supplementary Item No.02                      V1/KL25060937150796/2025/E**

Hear the applicant. The application is for variation of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL41D1233 operating on the route Elavanthy-Angamaly via Manjapra, Kalady, Thuravoor etc. The applicant seeks change in the number of route and alteration in termini which is not permissible under the provisions of section 80 (3) of the MV Act. The applicant has also furnished a new time table which will attract serious objections from other existing operators. The entire time schedule in existence has been changed resulting in the variation of timings. The said time table needs modification so as to conform to the provisions of sections 91 of the act and 13 of the Kerala Motor Transport Workers Act. Moreover a detail enquiry is necessary with regard to the violations if any of approved schemes. Therefore the applicant shall be required to further modify the proposed time schedule and resubmit for publication in the notice board of this authority for information of the interested operators.

This is a fit case for treating this application as an application for a fresh permit under the provisions of section 80(3) of the MV Act if so desired by the application. This matter can be taken up for reconsideration in the next meeting of this authority. The matter is **adjourned**.

**Supplementary Item No.03                      V3/KL25060947143371/2025/E**

Heard the applicant. The application is for renewal of regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL05AD6905 operating on the route Northparavoor-Perumbavoor for a period of five years each from

16.07.2014 till 15.07.2029. The permit holder has sort for variation of the existing route through Vedimara Junction to ParavoorNalvazhi via fire station road thereby getting rid of the prohibited overlapping. Hence the variation is **allowed** subject to a change in the terminus at Paravoorpvt.bus stand instead of Paravoor(zero). Applications for successive renewals of the permit are also **granted**.

**Supplementary Item No.04 V4/ KL25060917180674/2025/E**

Heard the applicant. The application for variation of the regular permit in respect of stage carriage KL09AS9293 operating on the route North Parvoor-Manjapra so as to avoid prohibited overlapping on the approved scheme in relation to the notified route Aluva-Vadakkumpuram but the applications for renewals of permit from 16.12.2013 have not come up for consideration of this authority. Hence the application for variation is **adjourned** for want of valid regular permit.

**Supplementary Item No.05 V4/ KL24122032676931/2025/E**

Heard the applicant. The application for renewal of regular permit in respect of bus KL419699 operating on the on the route Mala- Aluva as mofussil service. The application is in time.The route is not hit by the approved scheme of nationalization in relation to the route Aluva-Vadakkumpuram by virtue of pro tanto notifications. Therefore the application for renewal is **granted**.

**Supplementary Item No.06 V1/KL25052915582236 /2025/E**

Heard the applicants. The applications for transfer of permit in respect of bus KL01AP2277 operating on the route Chittoor ferry Fort Kochi from the name of Sudheer to George Thomas. The joint application submitted by the applicants appears to be for the purpose of disposal of the route bus KL01AP2277 by the applicant No.1 **“due to some financial difficulty/ lack of personal management” coupled with a request to sanction transfer of permit to facilitate the transfer of ownership of the vehicle** in the name of applicant No. 2.

There is no legal impediment in transferring the ownership of vehicle but the existing permit is not transferable save under exceptionable circumstance laid down under section 82 (2) of the Act or on emergence of similar circumstances like permanent disability of the permit holder, transfer by inheritance or transfer to the near relations out of love and affection etc. No such circumstances have been set forth in the joint application. Financial difficulty or lack of personal management are no germane reasons for transfer of permit.

The applicants have not submitted separate statements required by rule 178(2) of KMV Rules disclosing the matters required therein duly supported by necessary agreement of contract. In the absence such statements the enquiry contemplated under rule 178 (7) seems to be impossible to elicit the bonafides or otherwise of the application for transfer of permit. The financial stability and management expertise of the applicant No 2 are no valid grounds for permitting the transfer of permit. This authority is not satisfied of the bonafides of the application and hence the application is **rejected**.

**Item No.121**

**Next meeting on 20/09/2025**

Sd/-

Sri. NSK. Umesh IAS,  
District Collector and Chairman RTA Ernakulam

Sd/-

Smt. Hemalatha M.IPS,  
District Police Chief, Ernakulam Rural, Aluva and member RTA,  
Ernakulam

Sd/-

Sri. Anoop Varkey,  
Deputy Transport Commissioner (Law) CZ –II, Ernakulam and  
member RTA, Ernakulam

**RTA/KL07/DECISION/10.06.2025**