

PROCEEDING OF THE PERMIT GRANT COMMITTEE MEETING OF STA, ODISHA, CUTTACK HELD IN THE 7th FLOOR CONFERENCE HALL OF TRANSPORT COMMISSIONER-CUM-CHAIRMAN, STA, ODISHA ON 25TH, SEPTEMBER, 2019.

241.ROUTE- TURUBUDI TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA-BUDHAMBHA, KODALA AND BACK, SANTOSH KUMAR POLAI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD32B-3299.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. The distance is more than 160kms in one way. Applicant to submit revised timings as express service.

There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

242. ROUTE: DERANGA TO CHHAMUNDIA VIA ANGUL, MAHIDHARAPUR AND BACK, MANAS SAMAL, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR19M-3098.

Applicant is absent. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to clash free timing.

243.ROUTE:-GHANTAPADA TO BARGARH VIA SANKARBANJHI, LOISINGHA, SUKANTA MISHRA OWNER OF VEHICLE OR23D-7596.

Applicant is present. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of class free time.

244. ROUTE: CUTTACK TO JUNAGARH VIA BOUDH, SONEPUR AND BACK BICHITRA RANJAN BEHERA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR17H-9855.

Application has been withdrawn by the applicant.

245. ROUTE:- M RAMPUR TO KOTAGADA VIA BARAKHAMA, BALIGUDA, BAPINA KUMAR DAKUA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR18B-1034.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. There is one objection filed by Shri S.K.Bisoi, owner of vehicle No.OD18B-1034 represented by Advocate Shri A.K.Behera. He stated that there is clash of time at Baliguda. His service is departing Baliguda at 6.00AM whereas applicant has applied to depart Baliguda at 6.05AM which is five minutes after his service. Hence, he requested that ten minutes gap may be given to the vehicle of applicant.

9

This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

246.ROUTE:- KERADAGARH TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA DUHURIA, CHANDOL AND BACK, NIYAMAT KHAN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD29G-1186.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that he has applied in slot No.15A from Kendrapara and slot No.142B from Cuttack. There is one objection filed by Shri A.C.Rout, owner of vehicle No.OD05J-9745. He stated that there is clash of time from Keradagada. He has not mentioned his timing. This may be verified and considered subject to verification of clash free time.

247.ROUTE:- BANSADA TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA KENDRAPARA, TINI MUHANI AND BACK, DEBASIS PANDA OWNER OF VEHICLE OD29G-1266

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that he has applied in slot No.54B from Pattamundai and slot No.66B from Cuttack which was vacant after expiry of the PP allotted in respect of vehicle No.OR05AL-6890. Following objectors have given their objections as follows:

1. Shri Dinabandhu Swain, owner of vehicle No.OD05U-6199 is represented by Advocate Shri A.K.Behera. He stated that the applicant has applied with proposed departure time from Kendrapara at 9.45hrs which is exact departure time of his vehicle from Kendrapara. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be given in vacant slot.
2. S.M.Rasul, owner of vehicle No.OR05AK-7197 is represented by Advocate Shri M.B.K.Rao. His vehicle is departing Cuttack at 12.45hrs whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Cuttack at 12.36hrs. i.e. nine minutes ahead of his service. The applicant has proposed only one minute halting time at Cuttack. This should be verified.
3. Shri A.Lenka, owner of vehicle No.OD29B-4766 is represented by Advocate Shri D.B.Das. He stated that at Page-7

Q₂₁

in his petition, there is a map. Slot No.66 is Cuttack to Bhuinpur. But the applicant has applied Bansada to Cuttack via Kendrapara, Tini Muhani and back. The slot now applied by the applicant was earlier allotted to OSRTC and the permit allotted to OSRTC vehicle was valid till 28.5.2019. The applicant had exchanged the slots with the services of OSRTC and applicant was granted the slot No.39 while OSRTC was granted slot No.52. As per STA resolution, the vacant route should be notified. Hence, he requested that this may not be considered. Moreover, the route was Bhuinpur to Cuttack. Now applicant has applied from Bansarada to Cuttack. The people of Bhuinpur will be affected if this route will be given to the applicant. In this regard, the travelling public of Bhuinpur have filed a representation. This may be verified.

4. Shri S.K.Pradhan, owner of vehicle No.OD05AN-2845 is represented by Advocate Shri P.K.Behera. He stated that his objection is same as given by Shri A.Lenka, represented by Advocate Shri D.B.Das. Objector Shri S.K.Pradhan has already objected for allotment of slot No.54 to the applicant as the same slot is disputed and is under hearing stage by the Secretary, STA, Odisha.

5. Shri Vijayananda Dwibedy, owner of vehicle No.OR05AK-0939 stated that there is clash of time at Moto. His service is departing Moto at 7.14hrs whereas the applicant has applied at 7.17hrs. which is only three minutes after his service. He further stated that the applicant has applied one slot from Rajanagar and one slot from Rajakanika. This may be verified.

6. Shri R.N.Kar, owner of vehicle No.OD05AG-1394 is represented by Advocate Shri S.S.Mishra. He stated that, earlier the above route now applied by the applicant was allotted in favour of vehicle No.OR05AL-6890 of OSRTC which has been expired since 27.05.19. It should have been notified. Besides, he stated



that there is clash of time at Chandabali. In down trip, his departure time from Chandabali is at 7.49hrs whereas the applicant has applied to depart at 7.42hrs which is only seven minutes ahead of his service. Hence, he requested that T.P. may not be considered.

7. Shri B.Kar, owner of vehicle No.OD05S-4698 is represented by Advocate Shri S.S.Mishra. He stated that he has been allotted slot No.110 category-B from Cuttack side and slot No.68 category-B from Pattamundai side. He has applied for change of slot from 68 to slot No.54 which is pending for consideration. The applicant has now applied to obtain TP in slot No.54. Hence he requested that the slot No.54 may not be allowed in favour of the applicant and the route be notified.

This may be examined

248.ROUTE:-GOKRANPUR TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA JAMUNI, TARATARINI AND BACK, ANASUYA PANDA OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02C-7599.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri M.B.K.Rao. There is no objection. This may be verified and considered subject to verification of clash free time.

249.ROUTE:-PARADIP TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA JAYAPUR, TARAPUR AND BACK, RAJKISHOR SWAIN OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05AR-4525.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that he has applied in slot No.37 from Paradeep and slot No.64 from Cuttack. He has requested to extend his service upto Bhubaneswar instead of Cuttack. The following vehicle owners have given their objections as follows:

1. Shri Jagadish Nayak, owner of vehicle No.OR21C-9903 is represented by Advocate Shri S.S.Mishra. He stated that the applicant has applied departure time from Cuttack which is same with his time. The applicant has applied to depart Cuttack at 2.30PM whereas his departure time at Cuttack is same.

Q

2. Shri P.C.Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OD05AL-0129 is represented by Advocate Shri K.C.Das. He stated that the applicant has applied to depart Paradeep at 10.00AM whereas his vehicle is departing Paradeep at 10.00AM which is same time. Hence he requested that the applicant may be given in revised time and also after his service.

250.ROUTE:-BANSADA TO BHUBANESWAR VIA CHANDIKHOLE, KENDRAPARA, MRUTUYNJAY DAS, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05AR-5344.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that he has applied in vacant slot No.69B from Pattamundai and vacant slot No.166A from Cuttack. In the meantime slot No.166A from Cuttack has been allotted to some other existing vehicle for which he wants to change the available vacant slot nos.180A or 188A or 197A from Cuttack instead of 166A.

There is one objection filed by Shri A.C.Rout, owner of vehicle No.OR05AG-7406. He stated that applicant may be given in any vacant slot.

This may be verified and considered subject to clash free time.

251.ROUTE:- SURAPRATAPPUR TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA-DEOGAN, HARIPUR AND BACK, PABITRA MOHAN KHATUA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05A-3308.

Applicant is present. Following vehicles owners have given their objections as follows:

1. Shri D.K.Patra, owner of vehicle No.OR02BA-2617 is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that his vehicle is departing Bhubaneswar at 9.40hrs whereas the applicant has applied at 9.30hrs. i.e. ten minutes ahead of his service. The common corridor is upto Somal. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be given time after his service.

2. Shri A.Sahoo, owner of vehicle No.OD02C-3846 is represented by Advocate Shri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that his service is departing Bhuban at 5.10hrs whereas the applicant has

9

proposed to depart at 4.45hrs. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be given time at 4.30hrs. instead of 4.45hrs to depart Bhuban.

Applicant stated that there is a vehicle that departs Bhuban at 5.10 to 5.15hrs. This may be verified and considered subject to clash free time.

252. ROUTE:- CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) TO PURI VIA KALPANA ,PIPILI AND BACK, BIJAYA KETAN KHANDEI OWNER OF VEHICLE OR05AH-1888.

Applicant is present. He stated that he has applied on slot No.12 which is now vacant.

There is one objection filed by Shri B.R.Nayak, owner of vehicle No.OD04N-3985 through Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the applicant has not applied in vacant slot. His service in down trip is departing Puri at 12.00hrs. in slot No.153 whereas the applicant has applied to depart Puri at 12.00hrs which is same time. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be allowed in another vacant slot.

253.ROUTE:- PHULABANI TO BOLANGIR VIA BALANDAPADA ,LUISINGI AND BACK, RANJITA PRADHAN OWNER OF VEHICLE OR23-3379.

Applicant is present. The vehicle is 2004 model. Since the vehicle is more than fifteen years, this should not be considered as a part of road safety measure.

254.ROUTE:- KATAGAM TO JEYPORE VIA RAJODA , KOTPAD AND BACK, RABINDRA KU RATH OWNER OF VEHICLE OR10F-6846.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri P.K.Behera. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

255.ROUTE:-JODA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA-HARICHANDANPUR , DUBURI AND BACK, MANARANJAN SAHOO OWNER OF VEHICLE OD09H-3663.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. Following vehicle owners have given their objections.



1. Smt. S.L.Choudhury, owner of vehicle No.OD04A-1125 is represented by Advocate Shri S.S.Mishra and stated that he has applied for TP on the route Bamberi to Bhubaneswar with Keonjhar departure time at 06.05hrs at serial No.217. Now the applicant has applied TP on the route Joda to Bhubaneswar via Keonjhar with Keonjhar departure time at 06.00hrs which is just five minutes ahead of his service. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be given time twenty minutes gap after his service. Besides, he has stated that since the vehicle of the applicant is a sleeper coach, this should not be considered.

This may be verified whether the vehicle of the applicant is a sleeper coach or not. If so, this should not be considered. Otherwise, this may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

2. M.G.Alli Beg, owner of vehicle No.OD05C-0017 is represented by Advocate K.Mohammed. He stated that there is clash of time from Bhubaneswar to Jhumpura. The applicant has suggested twenty minutes ahead of his service at Bhubaneswar, ten minutes ahead at Cuttack, twelve minutes ahead at Chandikhole, fifteen minutes ahead at Duburi, two minutes ahead at Harichandanpur and arrived at Jhumpura five minutes later. Hence, he requested not to issue TP to the applicant.

3. Smt. Jharana Rout, owner of vehicle No.OD04N-1991 stated that her service is departing Cuttack at 15.40hrs whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Cuttack at 15.20hrs. i.e. twenty minutes ahead of his service. Hence, she requested that the applicant may be given thirty minutes gap after her service.

4. Smt. Jharana Rout, owner of vehicle No.OR04D-1991 stated that her service is departing Cuttack at 15.18hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart Cuttack at 15.20hrs. just two minutes after her service. Though the applicant has applied to depart Cuttack just two minutes after her service, but at

Q,

Chandikhole the vehicle of the applicant is reaching before her service.

5. Shri P.K.Sarma, owner of vehicle No.OR05AE-5851 stated that the applicant has applied new TP five minutes ahead of his service from Joda to Cuttack. Hence he requested that the applicant may be given TP on last come last go basis.

This may be verified.

256.ROUTE:- BOLANGIR TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA-CHARICHHAK, DASHAPALLA AND BACK, SOURAV SATAPATHY OWNER OF VEHICLE OD03P-6633.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri J.N.Mohanty. He stated that this is a night service. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

257.ROUTE:- INDHANPUR TO LAXMIPUR VIA JEYPORE ,KORAPUT AND BACK, SANGRAM KESHARI BARIK OWNER OF VEHICLE AP31TU-7878.

Applicant is absent. There is no objection.

258. ROUTE:- PAUNSIJHARAN TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA-BONTH , KENDUPADA AND BACK, MIR ABDUL RAUF OWNER OF VEHICLE OR11G-7647.

Applicant is absent. There is no objection.

259. ROUTE:- CHANDINIPAL TO ROURKELA VIA JAJPUR ROAD AND BACK, BINOD KUMAR LAKHANI OWNER OF VEHICLE OR22D5454.

Applicant has withdrawn the application.

260. ROUTE: BARGARH TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA BOINDA, ANGUL AND BACK, SATYAPRIYA DAS OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02V-4199.

Applicant is absent. There is no objection.

261.ROUTE: PURI TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA KALPANA, RASULGARH AND BACK PANCHANAN JENA OWNER OF VEHICLE OR02BK-9413

Applicant is present. Following vehicle owners have given their objections as follows:

9

1. Shri Upendra Pradhan, owner of vehicle No.OD02AC-6199 stated that he has applied for new TP in the said route vide sl.No.437. But his vehicle is a sleeper. This may be verified.

2. Shri A.K.Prusty, owner of vehicle No.OD13F-0504 is represented by Advocate Shri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that he has applied new TP in the same route vide sl.No.416.

Applicants of Sl.No.261,416 and 437 have applied in same route This is to be decided on merit.

262.ROUTE:-KATHAPAL TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA DUBURI, CHANDIKHOLE AND BACK HARIHAR NATH OWNER OF VEHICLE OR04M-1552.

Applicant is present. Following vehicle owners have given their objections as follows:

1. Shri S.K.Rout, owner of vehicle No.OR04K-1991 stated that there is clash of time at Duburi. His service is departing Duburi at 5.50hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 5.43hrs. which is only seven minutes ahead of his service.

2. Shri B.N.Rout, owner of vehicle No.OR05V-6366 is represented by Advocate Shri S.S.Mishra. He stated that there is clash of time at Duburi. His service is departing Duburi at 5.38hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 5.43hrs. i.e. just five minutes after his service. He requested that the applicant may be given time to depart Duburi at 5.25hrs.

3. Shri Jogesh Chandra Sarma, owner of vehicle No.OR09D-5851 stated that the applicant has proposed thirteen minutes ahead of his service from Duburi. From Cuttack, the departure time is same.

4. Shri Avinash Sahoo, owner of vehicle No.OD02C-3846 stated that at Bhuban, there is clash of time. His service is departing Bhuban at 5.10hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 4.55hrs. which is fifteen minutes ahead of his service. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be given in revised timing.

Q

5. Shri Debabrata Rout, owner of vehicle No.OR04J-5388 is represented by Advocate Shri P.K.Behera. He stated that the applicant has not mentioned the intermediate stoppages from Duburi to Cuttack. While proceeding from Duburi, the vehicle of applicant would reach Brahmani Bridge exactly the same timing as has been allotted to the objector. Taking advantage of non-mentioning the stoppage Brahmani Bridge, the applicant would operate his vehicle ahead of the service of objector from Brahmani Bridge upto Cuttack.

This may be verified and considered subject to clash free timing.

263. **ROUTE:** BERHAMPUR TO ROURKELA VIA RAIKAKHOL, NAKTIDEOL AND BACK, SABITA DASH OWNER OF VEHICLE OD16-7313.

Applicant is present. He stated that this is night service and also alter service of Sl.No.264. There is no objection.

264.**ROUTE:** BERHAMPUR TO ROURKELA VIA BOUDH DEOGARH AND BACK, SABITA DASH OWNER OF VEHICLE OD16-8313.

Applicant is present. He stated that this is night service and also alter service of Sl.No.263. There is no objection.

265.**ROUTE:** RARUAN TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA ANANDAPUR JAJPUR ROAD AND BACK, MAHESWAR SAHA OWNER OF VEHICLE OD04F-0225.

Applicant is present. Following vehicle owners have given their objections as follows:

1. Shri Dinabandhu Karmakar, owner of vehicle No.OD11A-0002 and Shri Deepak Karmakar, owner of vehicle No.OD11E-0002 are represented by Advocate Shri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that, at Bhubaneswar, there is clash of time in respect of his vehicle No.OD11E-0002. His service is departing Bhubaneswar at 16.50hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 16.50hrs. In return trip, the applicant has proposed to depart Chandikhole at 11.20hrs.

Q

whereas his service i.e. vehicle No.OD11A-0002 is departing at 11.41hrs just twenty-one minutes ahead of his service.

Applicant stated that the vehicle of above objectors are not operating in the route. This may be verified and considered subject to clash free timing.

266 **ROUTE:**TENSA TO BARBIL VIA RUGUDI, GUALI AND BACK, LOKANATH SAHOO OWNER OF VEHICLE OR09Q-2737.

Applicant is absent. Following vehicle owners have given their objections as follows:

1. Md. Israr Alli, owner of vehicle No.OD09B-6817 stated that his vehicle is departing Keonjhar at 13.05hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart Keonjhar at 12.55hrs just ten minutes ahead of his service. The applicant has also applied timings from Rimuli to Keonjhar and Keonjhar to Remuli just seven minutes before his vehicle. There is also another vehicle No.OD09F-2737 plying from Bolani to Harichandanpur and back which Keonjhar departure time is at 13.05hrs. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be given time after his service.
2. Shri M.R.Mishra, owner of vehicle No.OD09E-5737 is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the applicant has proposed the timings from Barbil to Keonjhar which is irrational. The timings applied by the applicant from Barbil to Keonjhar may be rational.
3. Shri J.P.Mishra, owner of vehicle No.OD09F-2737 is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that there is clash of time at Keonjhar. His service is departing Keonjhar at 13.05hrs whereas the applicant has applied at 12.55hrs just ten minutes ahead of his service. Hence, he requested that applicant may be given time after his service.

Q

267. **ROUTE:** LAING TO ROURKELA VIA BUDHI KUDAR, PANDRISILA AND BACK, BIBHUTI BHUSAN RANA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR14P-3487.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri S.S.Mishra. There is one objection filed by Shri Karma Oram, owner of vehicle No.OD14D-6328 through Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that there is clash of time at Rourkela. His departure time at Rourkela is 12.20hrs whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Rourkela at 11.55hrs which is just twenty five minutes ahead of his service. He requested that the applicant may be given time twenty minutes after his service on both sides.

This may be verified and considered subject to clash free time.

268. **ROUTE:** PATNAGARH TO BADAMBA VIA CHARICHHAK, MADHAPUR AND BACK, SRINIBASH MAHALIK OWNER OF VEHICLE OR05AN-6312.

Applicant is present. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

269. **ROUTE:** BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO KEONJHAR VIA PANIKOILI, JAJPUR ROAD AND BACK, SAROJA KUMAR PADHY OWNER OF VEHICLE OR05AP-0770.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri R.N.Singh. Following vehicle owners have given their objections as follows:

1. Shri B.B.Mishra, owner of vehicle No.OR09J-0026 is represented by Advocate Shri S.S.Mishra. He stated that there is clash of time at Cuttack in up trip. His service is departing Cuttack at 12.20hrs whereas the applicant has applied at 12.45hrs.
2. Shri M.R.Sahoo, owner of vehicle No.OR05R-3663 is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that there is clash of time at Bhubaneswar. His service is departing Bhubaneswar at 11.40hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Bhubaneswar at 11.30hrs just ten minutes of his service. He stated that since the route is under rationalization process, the TP may be considered in favour of the vehicle of the applicant after finalization of rationalization process.

Q

270. **ROUTE:** CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) TO ASTARANGA VIA ADASPUR, NIALI AND BACK, ANIL KUMAR ROURAY OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05AN-8201.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that he has applied from Cuttack in slot No.1, from Astarang in slot No.17, from Cuttack in slot No.32 and from Astarang in slot No.48.

There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

271. **ROUTE:**KANTEIPALLI TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA KODALA, KHALLIKOTE AND BACK, DILLIP KUMAR PAHAD Singh OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02BB-9329.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. There is one objection filed by Shri Chitrasen Nayak, owner of vehicle No.OR02BD-4151. He stated that there is clash of time at Polasra. His service is departing Polasara at 7.05hrs whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Polasara at 7.03hrs which is just two minutes ahead of his service. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be given time after his service.

Applicant also agreed to ply his vehicle after service of the above objector.

This may be verified and considered subject to clash free time.

272. **ROUTE:** DHARMAGARH TO RAYAGADA VIA DAHIKHALA, MUNIGUDA AND BACK, SANTOSH PANIGRAHI OWNER OF VEHICLE OD08J-9981.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri J.N.Mohanty.

There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

- 273.**ROUTE:** PURI MUNICIPALTY BUS STAND TO RAMESWAR VIA GADASAHIJANKIA, BAKU AND BACK, RINAMANI PRADHAN OWNER OF VEHICLE OR13E-1827.

Applicant is represented by his brother-in-law Shri Balakrishna Pradhan. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

Q

274. **ROUTE:** BALIPADAR TO BUGUDA AND BACK, SIBANARAYAN PRADHAN OWNER OF VEHICLE OD15D-2687.

Applicant is present. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

275. **ROUTE:** JHARSUGUDA TO SUNDARGARH AND BACK, ROSY DASH, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD23H-1600.

Applicant is represented her husband Shri S.S. Mohapatra. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

276. **ROUTE:** JHADAMALA GHATA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA KENDRAPARA, TINI MUHANI AND BACK, SARAT KUMAR MOHANTY OWNER OF VEHICLE OD29F-5020.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that he has applied in vacant slot No.70B from Pattamundai and slot No.117B from Cuttack. There is one objection filed by Shri S.K.Khillar, owner of vehicle No.OD04N-5255 represented by Advocate Shri A.K.Behera. He stated that there is clash of time at Cuttack. His service is departing Cuttack at 18.09hrs whereas the applicant has applied to depart Cuttack at 18.03 hrs which is just six minutes ahead of his service.

This may be verified and considered subject to verification of clash free time.

277. **ROUTE:** MATHAKARGOLA TO ANGUL VIA BALHAR, TALCHER AND BACK, SANANDA SAMAL OWNER OF VEHICLE OD04A-7358.

Applicant is present. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

278. **ROUTE:** PURI TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA KALPANA, RASULGARH AND BACK, KAMAL LOCHAN BISWAL OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05J-2499.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that he has applied in vacant slot No.37 from Puri and slot No.263 from Cuttack.

Q

There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time and also vacant slot.

279. **ROUTE:** BHUBANESWAR TO BHAWANIPATNA VIA KHURDA DASHPALLA, BOLANGIR AND BACK PRAMOD KUMAR RAY, OWNER OF VEHICLE AP02TC-9495.

Applicant is present. This is an other state registration vehicle. Applicant stated that he has applied for re-assignment of Odisha Regn. number. Without Odisha registration number permit will not be granted.

There is no objection.

280. **ROUTE:** BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO BHAWANIPATANA VIA DASHAPALLA, BOUDH AND BACK, PRAMOD KUMAR RAY OWNER OF VEHICLE AP29V-5799.

Applicant is present. This is an other state registration vehicle. Applicant stated that he has applied for re-assignment of Odisha Regn. number.

There is no objection. Without Odisha registration number no permit will be considered.

281. **ROUTE:** MAHADEIJODA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA BRAHMANIPAL, DUBURI AND BACK, PRAFULLA KUMAR SHARMA OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05AP-5851.

Applicant has withdrawn the application.

282. **ROUTE:** SORO TO KEONJHAR VIA SOSA, CHHENAPADI AND BACK, KULAMANI SAMAL OWNER OF VEHICLE OR09Q-1717.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri M.B.K.Rao. Following vehicles owners have given their objections as follows:

1. Shri B.Jena, owner of vehicle No.OR22B-5825 is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that there is clash of time from Soro to Keonjhar. His service is departing Soro at 6.05hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart Soro at 6.20hrs. just fifteen minutes after his service. When the applicant has proposed fifteen minutes after his service from Soro, but he is

Q,

overtaking the vehicle of the objector at Kupari. Hence he requested that the applicant may be allowed to depart Soro after 6.30hrs.

2. Shri A.K.Sahoo, owner of vehicle No.OR01K-9777 is represented by Advocate Shri D.B.Das. He stated that there is clash of time at Soro point. His service is departing Soro at 6.30hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Soro at 6.20hrs. just ten minutes ahead of his service. The clash of time is up to Ghatagaon.

3. Shri G.C.Jena, owner of vehicle No.OR22C-5709 is represented by Advocate K.Mohammed. He stated that there is clash of time from Ghatagaon to Angarpada which is 95kms. His service is departing Ghatagaon at 15.00hrs. whereas applicant has applied to leave Ghatagaon at 14.45hrs. which is fifteen minutes ahead of his service.

Applicant stated that the vehicle of the objector No.1 i.e. OR22B-5825 is not plying since long as reported by the RTOs of Keonjhar and Bhadrakh. He has enclosed the report of above two RTOs alongwith his petition.

283. **ROUTE:** KHURDHA TO HATIBARI VIA JAJPUR ROAD , ANANDAPUR AND BACK, MAMATA SWAIN OWNER OF VEHICLE OR05AG-2985.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. There is no objection. Since, this is a sleeper coach, TP may not be considered.

284. **ROUTE-** BHUSHAN TO ATTHAMALLIK VIA ANGAPADA, NAKCHI AND BACK, JAYANT KU SAHOO OWNER OF VEHICLE OD19J-0774.

Applicant is present. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

285. **ROUTE:** CHANDRAPUR TO ROURKELA VIA LEPHRIPADA, UJALPUR AND BACK, BIJAYASHREE SINGH OWNER OF VEHICLE OD16B-7272.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that he has applied in vacant slot No.48 from Sundargarh and slot No.97 from Rourkela. This is a rationalized route.

Q,

There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time and also vacant slot.

286.ROUTE: RIGHAGARH TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA TINI MUHANI, DUHURIA AND BACK, PRASANTA KUMAR JENA OWNER OF VEHICILE OD04G-8584.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that he has applied in slot No.7A from Pattamundai and slot No.93A from Cuttack.

There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

287.ROUTE:GAJARAJPUR TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA KENDRAPARA, TINI MUHANI AND BACK, PRASANTA KUMAR JENA OWNER OF VEHICILE OD04G-8684.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that he has applied in slot No.6A from Pattamundai and slot No.189A from Cuttack.

There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

288.ROUTE:BOLANGIR TO BALASORE VIA BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA), CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) AND BACK, GOPA PANDA OWNER OF VEHICLE OD01Z-7567.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri S.S.Mishra. There is one objection filed by Shri R.K.Periwal, owner of vehicle No.OR01S-7187 through Advocate K.Mohammed. He stated that there is clash of time at Bolangir up to Balasore and Cuttack to Balasore. His service is departing Bolangir at 18.10hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart Bolangir at 17.35hrs i.e. thirty-five minutes ahead of his service. His service is departing Cuttack at 3.55hrs. whereas applicant has proposed to depart Cuttack at 3.19hrs. which is thirty-six minutes ahead of his service. Besides, this objector has stated that the applicant had got PP as his alter

Q

service. Due to huge amount of arrear tax and penalty, renewal of PP has not been granted. Now the applicant has applied for earlier timing with new T.P. Hence, he requested that if the case of applicant shall be considered, then applicant may be given timing after his service.

The above objection raised by the objector may be verified and considered subject to verification of clash free time.

289. **ROUTE:** ROURKELA TO JODA VIA KALTA, KOIRHA AND BACK, SOMRA BARLA OWNER OF VEHICLE OR14R-5639.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty.

Following vehicle owners have given their objections as follows:

1. Shri P.K.Swain, owner of vehicle No.OR14Q-5474 is represented by Advocate Shri A.K.Behera. He stated that there is clash of time at Rourkela. His service is departing Rourkela at 9.45hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart Rourkela at 9.40hrs. which is only five minutes ahead of his service. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be allowed TP after his service.
2. Shri R.K.Pradhan, owner of vehicle No.OD14R-5179 is represented by Advocate Shri A.K.Behera. He stated that, there is clash of time at Barbil. His service is departing Barbil at 15.55hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Barbil at 15.45hrs. which is just ten minutes ahead of his service. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be given after his service.
3. Shri B.N.Mahanta, owner of vehicle No.OD09A-1051 is represented by Advocate Shri A.K.Behera. He stated that there is clash of time at Koida, Barbil and Joda points. His service is departing Koida at 16.52hrs, Barbil at 15.41hrs and Joda at 15.13hrs whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Koida at 16.46hrs, Barbil at 15.45hrs and Joda at 15.15hrs. The departure time gap proposed by the applicant at above three points comes to two minutes to six minutes. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be given TP in revised timings.

Q

This may be verified and considered subject to verification of clash free time.

290. **ROUTE:** ROURKELA TO BARGARH VIA JHARSUGUDA, RENGALI AND BACK, GYANARANJAN HOTA OWNER OF VEHICLE OR16D-9042.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri HP.Mohanty. He stated that he has applied in slot No.18 from Rourkela, slot No.64 from Sundargarh, slot No.127 from Sambalpur and slot No.121 from Sundargarh.

There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

291. **ROUTE:** CHANDANESWAR TO AIIMS VIA SORO, BHADRAK AND BACK, RAJESH MOHAPATRA OWNER OF VEHICLE OR22B-5257.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty.

There are three objections have been filed by the following vehicle owners.

1. Sandhyarani Choudhury, owner of vehicle No.OD04L-1125 is represented by Advocate Shri S.S.Mishra. He stated that there is clash of time at Cuttack point i.e. the applicant has proposed departing time from Cuttack in five minutes ahead of her service.
2. Shri S.N.Das, owner of vehicle No.OR22E-5484 stated that there is clash of time at Bhadrakh. His service is departing Bhadrakh at 7.50hrs whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Bhadrakh at 7.50hrs which is same time.
3. Shri B.K.Periwal, owner of vehicle No.OR01V-1187 is represented by Advocate K.Mohammed. He stated that there is clash of time from Balasore and it will continue up to Bhubaneswar. His departure time from Balasore is 6.00hrs.whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Balasore at 5.55hrs. i.e. five minutes ahead of his service.

Since the vehicle of the applicant is more than fifteen years old vehicle, TP may not be considered.

2,

292. **ROUTE:** BANKAKHAJURI TO KEONJHAR VIA BARTANA, BANIANPANK AND BACK, MR.GANESH CHANDRA JENA OWNER OF VEHICLE OD01V-2288.

Applicant is present. Following vehicle owners have given their objections as follows:

1. Shri A.K.Sahoo, owner of vehicle No.OR01K-9777 is represented by Advocate Shri D.B.Das. He stated that there is clash of time at several points. Besides, he stated that the Bankakhajuri is a place inside Balasore Town.

Applicant agreed to start from Rasolpur which is not inside the township of Balasore instead of Bankakhajuri. (This may be verified).

2. Shri B.Jena, owner of vehicle No.OR22B-5825 is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that there is clash of time at Soro. His service is departing Soro at 6.05hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 5.50hrs which is fifteen minutes ahead of his service. Hence, he requested that the timing may be revised at Soro and considered after his service.

This may be verified and considered subject to verification of clash free time.

293. **ROUTE:** POLASARA TO KOSAGUMUDA VIA RAYAGADA, LAXMIPUR AND BACK, HARAPRIYA ACHARYA OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02AH-8855.

Applicant is present and stated that he has applied as alter service of SI.No.299.

There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

294. **ROUTE:** BERHAMPUR TO DUNGURIPALI VIA BOUDH, RAIRAKHOL AND BACK SABITA DASH OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02AH-5553.

Applicant is present and stated that he has applied as alter service of SI.No.300.

There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

Q

295. **ROUTE:** CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) TO PURI VIA KALPANA, PIPILI AND BACK, MADHUSMITA BARIK OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05AP-3799.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri D.B.Das. Since this is a sleeper coach, this should not be considered.

296. **ROUTE:** CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) TO KOSAGUMUDA VIA SONEPUR, BOLANGIR AND BACK, SANJUKTA MISHRA OWNER OF VEHICLE OD14F-1111.

Applicant is represented by his Manager Shri R.K.Pattnaik. He stated that this is alter service of SI.No.325. He has applied TP as night service in the above route. There is no objection.

This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

297. **ROUTE:** JAMBU TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA DUHURIA, CHANDOL AND BACK, PRAMODKUMAR MOHANTY OWNER OF VEHICLE OR05AM-6914.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. Following vehicle owners have given their objections as follows:

1. Shri M.K.Mohanty, owner of vehicle No.OD05AA-4814 is represented by Advocate Shri K.C.Das. He stated that there is clash of time at Cuttack. His service is departing Cuttack at 5.03AM whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Cuttack at 16.36hrs. which is only eight minutes ahead of his service. He also stated that the applicant has not applied in vacant slot. Hence he requested that the applicant may be given time in any vacant slot.

Applicant stated that he has applied in slot No.130A from Kendrapara, slot No.166A from Cuttack.

This may be verified and considered subject to clash free time.

298. **ROUTE:** CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) TO AUL VIA DUHURIA, TINI MUHANI AND BACK SUDHIRKUMAR SATAPATHY OWNER OF VEHICLE OR09K-1857.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri Chandan Mishra.

There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.



299. **ROUTE-** POLASARA TO KOSAGUMUDA VIA RAYAGADA, KORAPUT AND BACK, SMT HARI PRIYA ACHARYA OWNER OF VEHICLE OR07AA-8108.

Applicant is present and stated that he has applied as alter service of SI.No.293.

There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

300. **ROUTE-** BERHAMPUR TO DUNGURIPALLI VIA SAMBALPUR BARGARH AND BACK, SABITA DASH OWNER OF VEHICLE OR02BV-5127.

Applicant is present and stated that he has applied as alter service of SI.No.294.

There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

- 301.**ROUTE-**SATAPADA TO DHABALESWAR VIA-CHANDANPUR, SAKHIGOPAL AND BACK, PRASANTA KUMAR PRADHAN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR02BQ-0104.

Applicant is present. He stated that he may be allowed to include one stoppage at CDA, Cuttack.

There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

- 302.**ROUTE-**PODADIHA TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA JATAMUNDIA, PATHAPUR AND BACK, RAKESH BEHERA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR02BJ-9748.

Applicant is present.

There is one objection given by Shri T.K.Tarai, owner of vehicle No.OD05AM-8296 is represented by Advocate Shri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that at Banki, there is clash of time. His service is departing Banki at 6.30hrs whereas the applicant has applied at 7.00hrs.

This may be verified and considered subject to verification of clash free time.



303. **ROUTE –** KANTABANJI TO BOLANGIR VIA TITILAGARH, BELGAON AND BACK, BIKASH KUMAR NANDA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR03F-5679.

Applicant has withdrawn his application.

304. **ROUTE –** BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO KARANJIA VIA HARICHANDANPUR, GHATGAON AND BACK, SMT KUNU MOHANTY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD08-5818.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri S.S.Mishra. Following vehicle owners have given their objections as follows:

1. Shri D.N.Patra, owner of vehicle No.OR05AN-9275 is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that there is clash of time from Bhubaneswar to Karanjia.
2. Smt. S.Swain, owner of vehicle No.OD04K-8685 is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that there is clash of time at Bhubaneswar and Cuttack. His departure time from Bhubaneswar is 4.15hrs whereas the applicant has applied at 4.10hrs, his departure time from Cuttack is 5.25hrs whereas applicant has applied at 5.10hrs. just five minutes and fifteen minutes ahead of his service.
3. Shri S.K.Mohanty, owner of vehicle No.OD11J-1790 stated that there is clash of time at Ghatagaon. His service is departing Ghatagaon at 9.25hrs whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 9.21hrs which is only four minutes ahead of his service.

Since the vehicle of the applicant is a sleeper coach, this may not be considered. (This may be verified).

305. **ROUTE –** BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO RAJGANGPUR VIA BOUDH, SONEPUR AND BACK, HIMANSU BHUSAN CHAMPATY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02Y-5127.

Applicant is present and stated that this is alter service of SI.No.308. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

Q

306. **ROUTE –** HINJILI TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA BERHAMPUR, CHHATRAPUR AND BACK, MUKESH KUMAR JENASAMANTA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02AH-6547.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty.

There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

307. **ROUTE –** BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO ANGUL VIA JATAMUNDIA, BHAPUR AND BACK, MANAS RANJAN SAHOO, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02AY-1305.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. Following vehicle owners have given their objections as follows:

1. Shri S.S.Mishra, Advocate appeared on behalf of the Shri Himansu and stated that at Bhubaneswar there is clash of time. His service is departing Bhubaneswar at 4.22hrs whereas the applicant has applied to depart Bhubaneswar at 4.08 hrs. i.e. fourteen minutes ahead of his service. He requested that the time gap may be maintained.
2. Smt. Binodini Das stated that her vehicle is departing at 4.15hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 4.08hrs.

Applicant stated that the alignment is different.

3. Shri A.K.Samantaray stated that at Angul, the applicant has applied five minutes behind of his service. Hence, he requested that the time gap may be maintained.

This may be verified.

308. **ROUTE –** BHUBANESWAR TO SUNDARGARH VIA NAYAGARH BOUDH SAMBALPUR JHARSUGUDA AND BACK, SMRUTIRANJAN MISHRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02BA-5127.

Applicant is present and stated that this is alter service of SI.No.305. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

Q,

309. **ROUTE –** BERHAMPUR TO KOTAGADA VIA KALINGA, G.UDAYAGIRI AND BACK, MR. BASANTA KUMAR BISOYI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR12A-9066.

Applicant is present. Following vehicle owners have given their objections as follows:

1. Shri P. Anil Kumar, owner of vehicle No.OR07Z-2088 stated that in down trip, there is clash of time at Kalinga. The applicant has applied five minutes ahead of his service. He stated that the applicant may be given time after his service.
2. Shri M.R.Pradhan, owner of vehicle No.OR12-3997 stated that there is clash of time from Kotagada. The applicant has applied two minutes ahead of his service. Hence, he requested that applicant may be given time after his service.

310. **ROUTE –** BALIGUDA TO NAYAGARH VIA CHAKAPADA, BADALA AND BACK, KABITA SWAIN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR13D-3357.

Applicant has withdrawn the application.

311. **ROUTE –** BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO BOLANI VIA JAJPUR ROAD, ANANDAPUR AND BACK, MANISH BARIK, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05AG-4999.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri D.B.Das. He stated that this is alter service of SI.No.392. Following vehicle owners have given their objection as follows:

1. Shri P.B.Tripathy, owner of vehicle No.OD05X-1149 is represented by Advocate Shri S.S.Mishra. He stated that the departure time mentioned by the applicant at Cuttack is exact time of his service. His service is departing Cuttack at 21.40hrs whereas the applicant has applied at 21.50hrs. just ten minutes after his time. He requested that if the applicant shall be allowed TP, then the departure timing from Cuttack in up trip may be given after 22.15hrs.

Since the applicant has applied TP as night service, the same may be considered after the service of the objectors i.e. five minutes gap.

Q,

312. **ROUTE –** BHATAPADA TO ANGARGAON VIA BHATAPADA, KUMBHARAGAON AND BACK, DIPU BARIK, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR02AQ-1188.

Applicant is absent. Following vehicle owners have given their objections as follows:

1. Shri S.K.Pati, owner of vehicle No.OD07H-3099 stated that the applicant has applied jumping time from Angargaon to Kodala. His service is departing Angargaon at 8.45hrs whereas the applicant has applied at 9.05hrs. Since the applicant has applied twenty minutes after his service, but his vehicle will reach Kodala at 10.05hrs i.e. before fifteen minutes reaching time of objector's vehicle. Hence, he stated that the applicant may be allowed TP maintaining sufficient time gap.

2. Shri A.P.Mishra, owner of vehicle No.OD07V-6899 stated that there is clash of time at Angargaon. Applicant has proposed to depart Angargaon at 5.10hrs whereas his departure time at 5.15hrs. i.e. only five minutes gap. There is another vehicle of this objector bearing No.OD07Q-6899 also plying in this route under RTA permit whose departure time at Kodala is at 4.55PM whereas the applicant has applied at 4.25PM.

This may be verified and considered subject to clash free time.

313. **ROUTE –** MANDA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA KARANJIA, THAKURMUNDA AND BACK, KASHINATH MAHALA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR05AS-9195.

Applicant is absent. No objection.

314. **ROUTE –** DASPUR TO BISSAMCUTTACK VIA CHHATIGUDA, BISWANATHPUR AND BACK, ALIBHA PATRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR03H-5837.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri J.N.Mohanty. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

Q

315. **ROUTE –** CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) TO TIKABALI VIA NAYAGARH, DASHAPALLA AND BACK, SATYAJIT DIXIT, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD12A-6342.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that this route is vacant. He has applied this route which was earlier allotted to his another vehicle which stands in the name of his son.

It may be verified whether it is a sleeper coach or not before consideration of TP.

316. **ROUTE –** BAUNSAGARH TO AIIMS VIA PANIKOILI CHANDIKHOLE AND BACK, GITARANI BEHERA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD09B-8726.

Applicant is absent. There is no objection.

317. **ROUTE –** BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO DENGAPADAR VIA BUGUDA, BALIPADAR AND BACK, AKHAYA KUMAR ROUTARAY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02E-2830.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri S.S.Mishra. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

318. **ROUTE –** LAHUNIPARA TO LAIDA VIA LAIMURA, BHOJPUR AND BACK, KUMUDINI MAHAKUL, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR15D-2157.

Since this is a 1999 model vehicle, this may not be considered for safety of the commuters.

319. **ROUTE –** AIIMS TO BAISINGA VIA PANIKOILI, BHADRAK AND BACK, SATYANARAYAN DAS, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05AD-5484.

Applicant is present. It may be verified whether it is a sleeper coach or not. Following vehicle owners have given their objections as follows:

1. Shri J.K.Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OD22M-9311 stated that the applicant has proposed departure time from Bhadrakh which is only two minutes ahead of his service. His service is departing Bhadrakh at 9.10hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 9.08hrs. He further stated that the

Q

departure time gap proposed by the applicant at Soro and Balasore is very less with the existing timing of this objector.

2. Anupama Rout, owner of vehicle No.OD04N-0091 stated that there is clash of time at Cuttack. Her service is departing Cuttack in up trip at 6.10hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed departure time at 6.10hrs which is exact time of her vehicle. Hence, she requested that since the rationalization of timing is under process, the case of applicant may be considered after completion of rationalization process.

3. Shri S.K.Rout, owner of vehicle No.OD04L-1991 stated that there is clash of time from Cuttack up to Balasore. His service is departing Cuttack at 6.20hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart Cuttack at 6.10hrs. just ten minutes ahead of his service. Hence, he requested that since the rationalization of timing is under process, the case of applicant may be considered after completion of rationalization process.

4. Pravati Nalini Samantaray, owner of vehicle No.OD05G-7799 stated that there is clash of time at Bhadrakh and Soro.

5. Shri A.Chiranjeeb, owner of vehicle No.OD01Q-3727 is represented by Advocate Shri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that there is clash of time at Balasore. His departure time from Balasore is 15.00hrs whereas the applicant has applied at 14.55hrs. just five minutes ahead of his service. He further stated that when the objector himself has been denied TP on the route Bhubaneswar to Choumukhi covering the same rationalized corridor, the case of applicant should not be considered.



It may be verified whether the vehicle of the applicant is a sleeper coach or not. If it is found the vehicle is sleeper coach, T.P. may not be considered.

320. **ROUTE –** GADABISHNUPUR TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA BALIKUDA, JAGATSINGHPUR AND BACK, SUNIL KUMAR PADHI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05AR-9439.

Applicant is absent.

The slot applied by this applicant is same slot of serial No.151 and serial No.337. The following vehicle owners have given their objections as follows: The objections are combined and to be heard together.

1. Shri S.Satapathy, owner of vehicle OR02BA-0863 stated that the departure time given by the applicant at Jagatsinghpur is almost same. There is no vacant slot.
2. Shri R.N.Behera, owner of vehicle No.OR05AJ-6169 stated that the applicant has not applied in rationalized timings. There is clash of time at Jagatsinghpur point.
3. Manjulata Rout, owner of vehicle No.OD02BE-3536 is represented by Advocate Shri A.K.Behera. He stated that he has applied TP in the route Garia to Cuttack 2 RT in Cuttack-Jagatsinghpur rationalized route. During pendency of his application the slot time 9.20 from Jagatsinghpur has been allotted in favour of another vehicle. In this regard, he has requested that the slot time 5.35 from Jagatsinghpur, slot No.44 from Cuttack, slot No.69 from Jagatsinghpur and slot No.89 from Cuttack may be given to him in favour of his vehicle No.OD02BE-3536.

Shri K.C.Das, Advocate stated that it has been decided to consider the TP application of Sl.151,320 and 337 jointly as all have applied in the same slot timing.

This may be verified.

Q

321. **ROUTE** – BHANJANAGAR TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA KHALIKOTE CHHAKA, KESHPUR AND BACK, PRIYANSU SEKHAR PARIDA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD07T-4666.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri A.K. Behera. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

322. **ROUTE** – ROURKELA TO SINGHPUR VIA KAMAKHYANAGAR, BHUBAN AND BACK, RATNAKAR BAL, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05H-0056.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri Chandan Mishra. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

323. **ROUTE** – KUNJAR TO BADMAL VIA NIKTIMAL, JHARIBAHAL AND BACK, KSHIROD KUMAR PATEL, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD15L-5963.

Applicant is present. He wanted to withdraw his application. Hence, application may be treated as withdrawn.

324. **ROUTE** – CHANDAHANDI TO JEYPORE VIA DABUGAM, PAPADAHANDI AND BACK, TIRIPATI PANIGRAHI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD24D-4947.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri P.K. Behera. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

325. **ROUTE** – CUTTACK TO KOSAGUMUDA VIA NAYAGARH, BOUDH BOLANGIR AND BACK, SANJUKTA MISHRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD33B-1111.

This is alter service of serial No.296.

326. **ROUTE** – BHANJKIA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA DHENKIKOTE, GHATGAON AND BACK, SABITARANI PANDA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR11H-9961.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri A.K. Behera. Following vehicle owners have given their objections as follows:



1. Shantilata Choudhury, owner of vehicle No.OD04A-1125 is represented by Advocate Shri S.S.Mishra. He stated that, since the vehicle of the applicant is a sleeper coach, this should not be considered as he has applied to ply the said vehicle as day service.

This may be verified.

327. **ROUTE –** KUNDALA TO KEONJHAR VIA KARANJIA, CHADHEIBHOL AND BACK, MAHESWAR SAHA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR11J-6845.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

328. **ROUTE –** SUKIA BAUTI TO PURUNAGARH VIA RASOL PS, SATAMILE AND BACK, NIROD KU PANDA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR19G-0826.

Applicant is present. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

329. **ROUTE –** CUTTACK TO BISSAM CUTTACK VIA KHURDA DASHPALLA PHULBANI AND BACK, DILLIP KUMAR SAHOO, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD33Y-4005.

Applicant is absent. There is one objection given by Shri Upendra Pradhan represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that his service is departing Bhubaneswar at 17.05hrs whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Bhubaneswar at 17.10hrs. which is only five minutes after his service. Hence, he requested that the case of applicant may be considered to depart Bhubaneswar in revised timing after 17.30hrs.

330. **ROUTE –** KUMARANGA TO BERHAMPUR VIA KHALIKOTE CHHAKA, RAMBHA AND BACK, SAMIR KUMAR MISRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR04K-0184.

Applicant is present. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

Q,

331. **ROUTE –** TARASAH TO PARADIP VIA BALIKUDA, JAGATSINGHPUR AND BACK, SEKH JAMAL, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR05AA-5345.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri K.C.Das. There is one objection filed by Shri Yosobanto Nayak, owner of vehicle No.OR21A-7757 represented by Advocate Shri S.S.Mishra. He stated that his service is departing Jagatsinghpur at 16.05hrs whereas the applicant has also proposed to depart Jagatsinghpur in same time. He stated that the applicant may be given time after his service. Besides, the objector has stated that from Tarasahi to Paradeep, there is no road. The bridge is under construction.

This may be verified before consideration of TP.

332. **ROUTE –** PURI MUNICIPALTY BUS STAND TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA KALPANA, RASULGARH AND BACK, PRATIVA KHANDAI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR05AB-3597.

Applicant is represented by her husband. He stated that he has applied in vacant slot from Puri and Cuttack.

There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

333. **ROUTE –** KARANJIA TO BAULA VIA MANOHARPUR, SATKOSIA AND BACK, RANJAN KUMAR SAHOO, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR09H-3886.

Applicant is present. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

334. **ROUTE –** MUKHIGUDA TO BHUBANESWAR VIA BHAWANIPATNA BOUDH ANGUL DHENKANAL AND BACK, JANARDAN PANDA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD08G-8155.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri J.N.Mohanty. He stated that this is alter service of serial No.335 and also night service.

Q

There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

335. **ROUTE –** MUKHIGUDA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA SONEPUR, BOUDH AND BACK, JANARDAN PANDA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD08G-8655.

This is alter service of serial No.334. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

336. **ROUTE –** CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) TO PURI MUNICIPALTY BUS STAND VIA KALPANA, PIPILI AND BACK, BIBEKANANDA KHANDAI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05AR-9898.

Applicant is present and stated that he has applied in slot No.35 and 229 from Cuttack and slot No.109 and 293 from Puri. Following vehicle owners have given their objections as follows:

1. Shri P.K.Pradhan, owner of vehicle No.OR05AB-1683 is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that this route is a vacant route of vehicle No.OSP-2897. The same has not been notified. Hence, he requested that the above vacant route may be notified inviting objections for grant of permit.
2. Shri Sibananda Swain, owner of vehicle No.OD05AA-9880 is represented by Advocate Shri K.C.Das. He stated that there is clash of time at Puri in the down trip. His departure time from Puri is 18.36hrs whereas the applicant has applied at 18.24hrs which is twelve minutes ahead of his service. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be given TP in any vacant slot and the slot in which the applicant has applied to obtain TP may be notified.

Applicant stated that he has applied in vacant slot.

This may be verified and considered if the slot applied by the applicant is vacant.



337. **ROUTE –** GARIA TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA JAGATSINGHPUR, CHARIPOLIA AND BACK, MANJULATA ROUT, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02BE-3536.

The route applied by the applicant is same route applied by the applicant of serial No.151 and 320.

Shri K.C.Das, Advocate appeared on behalf of one Minati Padhi, owner of vehicle No.OR21A-8739. He stated that in the permit committee meeting held on 24.9.19, it has been decided to consider the TP application of Sl.151,320 and 337 jointly as all have applied in the common route.

Besides, he stated that the departure time of the vehicle of this objector at Garia is 7.50hrs whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Garia at 7.45hrs which is five minutes ahead of his service. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be given time twenty minutes gap after his service from Garia to Cuttack or applicant may be allotted time in last come and last go time.

This may be verified.

338. **ROUTE –** RENGALI DAM TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA SATAMILE, BHAPUR AND BACK, KALLOLA KANTA SAHU, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD19J-0096.

Applicant has withdrawn the application.

There is one objection filed by Shri D.R.Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OD05AA-9343 represented by Advocate Shri M.B.K.Rao.

339. **ROUTE –** KHARIAR TO JHARBANDH VIA KHARIAR ROAD, BELTUKURI AND BACK, SADAN KUMAR TIWARI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD26-4554.

Applicant is present. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

Q,

340. **ROUTE –** PARADEEP TO ROURKELA VIA KENDRAPARA DHENKANAL AND BACK, NRUSINGH CHARAN NAYAK, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR05AS-4695.

Applicant is present. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

341. **ROUTE –** TANTIAPAL TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA TINI MUHANI, DUHURIA AND BACK, LALATENDU PATTANAIK, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02AY-0420.

Applicant is present. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

342. **ROUTE –** BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO PURI MUNICIPALTY BUS STAND VIA KALPANA, PIPILI AND BACK, ARATI PARIDA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02BB-8684.

Applicant is present. Following vehicle owners have given their objections as follows:

1. Shri H.N.Das, owner of vehicle No.OD02AP-6611 stated that he is the existing and senior operator in the route applied by the applicant. Hence, he stated that preference may be given to him to obtain permit in the timing applied by the applicant i.e. departure time at 4.45hrs from Bhubaneswar. Besides, he stated that the vehicle of the applicant is now plying in C.I.S.F. i.e. in Bhubaneswar air-port. In this regard, he has enclosed photo of said vehicle.
2. Shri B.N.Nayak, owner of vehicle No.OD05AR-6774 is represented by Advocate Shri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that he has applied TP in same route which has been placed at serial No.383. Besides, there is another applicant i.e. owner of vehicle No.OD02AC-9199 has also applied TP in the same route which has been placed at serial No.437.

Hence, the matter may be taken up together with serial No.342, serial No.383 and serial No.437.

Q

343. **ROUTE –** PADADIHA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA SORO, BHADRAK AND BACK, DURGA PERIWAL, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD01U-7787.

Applicant is absent. Following vehicle owners have given their objections as follows:

1. Shri Ratikanta Senapati, owner of vehicle No.OD22D-1555 is represented by Advocate Shri R.K.Sahu. He stated that there is clash of time at Bhadrakh. His service is departing Bhadrakh at 8.55hrs whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Bhadrakh at 8.57hrs. which is only two minutes gap. He further stated that, now the rationalization of timings in the route Balasore to Bhubaneswar is under process. Hence he requested that the case of applicant may be considered after finalization of rationalization of timings on the route Balasore – Bhubaneswar.

2. Shri R.K.Periwal, owner of vehicle No.OD01C-9587 is represented by Advocate K.Mohammed. He stated that there is clash of timing at Balasore point upto Cuttack. The departure time of his vehicle at Balasore is 7.15hrs whereas the applicant has applied to depart Balasore at 7.00hrs which is fifteen minutes ahead of his service. Hence, he requested that, since the route is under rationalization of timings, the applicant may not be given TP.

Further, he stated that the another vehicle of this objector i.e. vehicle No.OD01B-1187 has not been granted permit on this route despite order of Hon'ble Court, the case of applicant should not be considered.

3. Shri R.K.Parida, owner of vehicle No.OD22D-7727 is represented by Advocate Shri K.C.Das. He stated that there is clash of time at Bhadrakh and Soro point. His service is departing Bhadrakh and Soro point at 9.00hrs. and 8.00hrs. respectively whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Bhadrakh and Soro at 8.57hrs. and 8.01hrs. respectively

Q,

which is three minutes ahead of his service from Bhadrakh and one minute after his service from Soro.

4. Shri Brundaban Gaan, owner of vehicle No.OR01K-9999 is represented by Advocate Shri J.N.Mohanty. He stated that the entire route is under litigation. There are two writ petitions pending before the Hon'ble High Court. There is also pending a criminal writ in Civil Court, Balasore. Hence, he requested not to consider the grant of TP to the applicant.

344. ROUTE – BIJATALA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA KARANJIA, THAKURMUNDA AND BACK, BIJAYA KUMAR SAHOO, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR05AS-3663.

Applicant is present. Following vehicle owners have given their objections as follows:

1. Priya Das, owner of vehicle No.OR01Q-3333 stated that there is clash of time at Karanjia. Her service is departing Karanjia at 21.34hrs whereas the applicant has applied at 21.25hrs which is just nine minutes ahead of her service. Hence, she requested that the applicant may be given time gap thirty minutes after her service.

2. Swarnalata Das, owner of vehicle No.OD11E-4898 stated that there is clash of time from Bisoi to Karanjia which is same.

This may be verified and considered subject to clash free time.

345. ROUTE – NARAYANPUR TO GHATGAON VIA RANBHAG, JAJPUR TOWN AND BACK, SK DAULAT, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD22P-8786.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty.

There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

Q.

346. **ROUTE –** BELPAHAR TO SAMBALPUR VIA GANESHNAGAR, RENGALI AND BACK, TRILOCHAN PRASAD JAISWAL, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD23-9643.

Applicant has withdrawn the application.

347. **ROUTE –** KANTILO TO BHINGARPUR VIA JANLA, BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) AND BACK, SASMITA MISHRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR15R-9500.

Applicant is present. There is no objection.

This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

348. **ROUTE –** BHATAPADA TO BALASORE VIA JAGANNATHPUR, ANANTAPUR AND BACK, NILAMANI ROUT, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR22E-4575.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri A.K.Behera.

There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

349. **ROUTE –** BARBIL TO KOIRHA VIA RUGUDI AND BACK, ABADUL HANNAN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR11J-5232.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri Dipanshu Das. Following vehicle owners have given their objections as follows:

1. Shri H.K.Mahanta, owner of vehicle No.OD09E-7895 is represented by Advocate Shri M.B.K. Rao. He stated that there is clash of time at Keonjhar point. His service is departing Keonjhar at 11.55hrs whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Keonjhar at 11.45hrs which is ten minutes ahead of his service.
2. Shri B.N.Mahanta, owner of vehicle No.OD09C-2918 is represented by Advocate Shri A.K.Behera. He stated that there is clash of time at Koida upto Joda i.e. 45kms. His service is departing Koida at 7.20hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Koida at 7.10hrs. which is ten minutes ahead of his service.

Ω,

3. Shri M.R.Mishra, owner of vehicle No.OD09E-5737 is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that there is clash of time at Keonjhar. His service is departing Keonjhar at 12.00hrs whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Keonjhar at 11.45hrs. which is fifteen minutes ahead of his service. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be allowed to depart Keonjhar after his service.

This may be verified and considered subject to verification of clash free time.

350. **ROUTE –** CUTTACK TO KENDRAPARA VIA CHANDIKHOLE AND BACK, MANOJ KUMAR MOHANT, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05AA-4814.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the applicant had earlier applied permit on the same route from Badadandua to Cuttack. He has surrendered the old permit and applied this TP. While applying for the T.P. through OPMS, inadvertently the route has been inserted from Pattamundai to Bhubaneswar though the existing route is up to Kendrapada and then Badadandua. Further he stated that the vehicle will not go to Pattamundai and will go to Badadandua.

This may be verified and considered subject to clash free time.

351. **ROUTE –** CUTTACK – KENDRAPARA, BISWANATH NAYAK, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR29-3574.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri M.B.K.Rao.

There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

352. **ROUTE –** KEREDAGARH TO BHUBANESWAR VIA TINI MUHANI CHANDIKHOLE AND BACK, GAYADHAR SWAIN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05AN-3499.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. Following vehicle owners have given their objections as follows:

Q

1. Shri H.K.Nayak, owner of vehicle No.OD05AQ-0848 is represented by Advocate Shri S.S.Mishra. He stated that he has applied for new TP on the route Chandabali to Bhubaneswar and back in slot No.72/DN/'B' and 187 Up category-A in the Cuttack to Parramundai rtionalised route which is at serial No.218. The applicant has applied in slot No.72 DN, category 'B'. He stated that the vehicle of the applicant is a lower model than his vehicle. Hence, he requested that slot No.72, category 'B' DN should not be allotted in favour of vehicle of the applicant.
2. Shri R.N.Mahala, owner of vehicle No.OD05Y-9192 is represented by Advocate Shri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that his contention is no more valid as applicant has applied in other route.
3. Shri S.K.Patra, owner of vehicle No.OD05Y-9192 is represented by Advocate Shri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that there is clash of time at Paradeep point. His service is departing Paradeep at 18.50hrs whereas the applicant has applied at same time to depart Paradeep. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be given in any vacant slot after his service.
4. Shri B.Kar, owner of vehicle No.OD05S-4698 is represented by Advocate Shri S.S.Mishra. He stated that the applicant has applied TP in slot No.110, Cat-B i.e. 17.21(dep. Time), up trip which has already been allotted to his vehicle No.OD05S-4698 the TP is valid from 11.7.19 to 7.11.19. Hence he requested that the TP may not be considered in favour of the applicant in slot No.110 which has already been allotted to his vehicle.

This may be verified.

Q

353. **ROUTE –** UDAYPUR TO MV 88, SABITA BISOI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD24A-9585.

Applicant is absent. The application is an incomplete application and fee has not been deposited.

This should not be considered and treated as rejected.

354. **ROUTE –** UDAYPUR TO JEYPORE AND BACK, MAHESWAR BISOI, OWNER OF VEHICLE AP35T-8595.

Applicant is absent.

Since, this is an other state registered vehicle and more than fifteen years old, this should not be considered.

355. **ROUTE –** IB THERMAL TO BALASORE AND BACK, MR MANORANJAN MISHRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD01G-0699.

Applicant is absent. Following vehicle owners have given their objections as follows:

1. Shri R.K.Periwal, owner of vehicle No.OD01U-7889 is represented by Advocate Shri K.Mohammed. He stated that the route applied by the applicant is affecting his two services i.e. vehicle No.OD01U-7889 and OR01S-3987. Hence, he requested that, applicant may be given time after his service.
2. Shri H.K.Padhi, owner of vehicle No.OD22B-3287, Shri B.K.Padhi, owner of vehicle No.OD22J-2987 and Shri A.K.Padhy, owner of vehicle No.OD22-4287 have submitted a joint objection through Shri J.N.Mohanty, Advocate. They stated that there is clash of time at Bhadrakh. They have given the departure time from Bhadrakh in respect of above three vehicles. Vehicle No.OD22-B-3287 is departing Bhadrakh at 19.00hrs. Vehicle No.OD22J-2987 is departing Bhadrakh at 18.58hrs and vehicle No.OD22-4287 is departing Bhadrkh at 18.25/18.35hrs whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Bhadrakh at 18.57hrs. Hence, he requested that the applicant may not be considered for TP in the applied timings.

Q,

Since the application is incomplete, this may be rejected.

356. **ROUTE –** SINGHPUR TO PARADIP VIA JARAKA, CHANDIKHOLE AND BACK, SWARUP KUMAR MISHRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD11-2461.

Applicant is absent. There is one objection filed by Shri Vijayananda Dwibedi, owner of vehicle No.OD05W-5257. He stated that there is clash of time at Chandikhole. His service is departing Chandikhole at 16.15hrs whereas the applicant has applied to depart Chandikhole at 16.10hrs. The clash of time is upto Singhpur which is 68kms. He further stated that since the route is under rationalization process, applicant may not be considered for TP till rationalization process is completed.

357. **ROUTE –** JAMUNAKOTE TO ANGUL VIA BHALUMUNDA PARJANG AND BACK, SUSHIL KU BEHERA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD19L-0306.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri M.B.K.Rao. Following vehicle owners have given their objections as follows:

1. Renubala Parida, owner of vehicle No.OR05AK-7015 is represented by Advocate Shri S.S.Mishra. He stated that there is clash of time at Parajang. Her service is departing Parajang at 9.10hrs whereas the applicant has applied in exact time i.e. 9.10hrs from Parajang. There is also clash of time at Talcher and Anugul. Then, she has requested that the applicant may be given time ten minutes after her service.
2. Shri Sadananda Behera, owner of vehicle No.OR06H-9274 is represented by Advocate K.Mohammed. He stated that there is clash of time at Talcher upto Anugul. Applicant has proposed to depart Angul just nine minutes ahead of his service. Similarly, in uptrip, there is clash of time at Talcher up

Q

to Angul. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be given later timing.

This may be verified and considered subject to clash free time.

358. **ROUTE –** VIKASH GOPE, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD14C6594.

There is no description of route and it appears that this is an inter-state route application. This should not be considered here.

359. **ROUTE –** INDRAGADA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA BAHADAJHOLA, MAHIPUR AND BACK, ASHUTOSH SARANGI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02BC-2289.

Applicant is present. Following vehicle owners have given their objection as follows:

1. Sabirarani Panda, owner of vehicle No.OR07S-3231 stated that applicant has not mentioned the via route in which he want to obtain TP. She stated that there are three via route from Bhanjanagar to Indragada. Applicant has wrongly mentioned 16kms distance from Bhanjanagar to Indragada which is actually 39kms via Mujagada, Birikote Bibbil and 28kms. via Daha and 24kms via Bahadapadar. Hence, she has requested that the applicant may be given TP in the route applied for via Daha where no bus service is available. She has also given a route map. She has also submitted an online objection in respect of her another vehicle No.OR07Y-3573 in which no specific objection has been mentioned.

Applicant stated that due to OPMS fault, the distance has not been mentioned.

This may be verified and considered subject to clash free time.

Q


360. **ROUTE –** DHENKANAL TO BERHAMPUR VIA JANLA, KHURDHA AND BACK, BIMAL SHANKAR SINGHDEO, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02AH-7003.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that he wants to delete Athgarh and ply via Naduapada.

Following vehicle owners have given their objections as follows:

1. Shri S.K.Mohanty, owner of vehicle No.OD02AS-6957 stated that the applicant has applied to ply his service twenty minutes ahead of his service at Berhampur. His service is departing Berhampur at 14.25hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 14.05hrs.
2. Shri J.P.Sahoo, owner of vehicle No.OD05AM-0102 is represented by Advocate Shri S.S.Mishra. He stated that since the applicant has deleted the Athagarh point, he has no objection.

This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.


22-10-2019
Chairman
STA, Odisha, Cuttack