

PROCEEDINGS 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 6TH MARCH, 2020.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

1. Shri Sanjeeb Panda, I.P.S., Chairman.
Transport Commissioner-Cum-Chairman,
STA, Odisha, Cuttack.
2. Shri Srinibas Behera, OAS(SAG), Member.
Secretary, STA, Odisha, Cuttack.
3. Mrs.Kanak Champa Meher,OAS(I) Member.
Deputy Secretary, STA, Odisha, Cuttack.

1.ROUTE- BHAWANIPATNA TO DARINGBADI VIA TUMUDIBANDHA, KURTAMGADA AND BACK; VEHICLE NO.OD02BC-6155, OWNER - CHAIRMAN-CUM-MANAGING DIRECTOR, OSRTC:

Applicant is represented by Shri P.K. Hota, DTM, Operation, OSRTC Head Office He stated that this is alter service of OD02BC-6153. There is no objection. This may be considered after verification of clash free time.

2. ROUTE- ROUND TRIP FROM ROURKELA VIA KEONJHAR AND BARBIL, VEHICLE NO.OD14H-0698, OWNER – CMD, OSRTC.

Applicant is represented by his staff Shri P.K.Pattnaik, DTM I/C, OSRTC, Rourkela. He stated that this is alter service of OD14H-0701. There is no objection. This may be considered after verification of clash free time.


3. ROUTE- BHANJANAGAR TO SUNEVEDA VIA BERHAMPUR, ASKA AND BACK, VEHICLE NO.OD32C-4175, OWNER – CMD, OSRTC:

Applicant is represented by Shri P.K. Hota, DTM, Operation, OSRTC Head Office. He stated that this is alter service of OD32C-2521. There is no objection. This may be considered after verification of clash free time.

4. ROUTE- KHARIAR ROAD TO BOLANGIR VIA BUDHI KOMNA, LATHOR AND BACK, VEHICLE NO.OD14G-2790, OWNER – CMD, OSRTC:

Applicant is represented by Shri Biju Kumbha, Station Master, OSRTC, Nuapada.

There is one objection filed by Shri Manas Ranjan Das, owner of vehicle No.OD08H-7392. He stated that his service is plying on the route Nuapada to Bhawanipatna via Udyanbandh, Komna, Khariar, Bhawanipatna and back. The applicant has applied only two minutes gap of the timing of his vehicle. The common corridor is Nuapada to Komna which is 40 kms. distance. His departure time at Nuapada is 5.30AM whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 5.32AM. He further stated that another


3-4-2020

1. vehicle of OSRTC whose departure time from Nuapada is 6.18AM, but actually the said vehicle departs Nuapada at 5.30AM. Hence he requested that the proposed timing given by the ORTC may be modified. In presence of both applicant and objector, it is decided that the proposed departure time given by the OSRTC at Nuapada may be modified to 5.50AM instead of 5.32AM.

5. ROUTE- BOLANGIR TO KORAPUT VIA DHARMAGARH, PARLA AND BACK,
VEHICLE NO.OD14B-8437, OWNER – MD, OSRTC:

Applicant is represented by Shri P.K. Hota, DTM, Operation, OSRTC Head Office. He stated that they have applied in the above route in respect of their two vehicles which have been mentioned in sl.No.5 and 6. There is no objection. This may be considered after verification of clash free time.

6. ROUTE- BOLANGIR TO KORAPUT VIA DHARMAGARH, PARLA AND BACK,
VEHICLE NO.OD14B-8438, OWNER – MD, OSRTC:

Observations are as given in Sl.No.5 above.

7. ROUTE- PADMAPUR TO BHAWANIPATNA AND BACK, VEHICLE NO.OR17J-3867, OWNER – CMD, OSRTC, BHUBANESWAR:

Applicant is represented by Shri S.K.Mishra, Unit Incharge, OSRTC, Padmapur. He stated that this is alter service of OD02H-2173. There is no objection. This may be considered after verification of clash free time.

8. ROUTE- DEOGARH TO SODA VIA DUDHIANALI, DHOLAPUR AND BACK,
VEHICLE NO.OD28-4499, OWNER – CMD, OSRTC, BHUBANESWAR:

Applicant is represented by Shri P.K. Hota, DTM, Operation, OSRTC and Shri A.Biswal, Station Master, Deogarh. There is no objection. This may be considered after verification of clash free time.

9. ROUTE- MV 79 TO KATAGAM VIA GOVINDAPALI, TANGINIGUDA AND BACK,
VEHICLE NO.OD30-4912, OWNER – MD, OSRTC, BHUBANESWAR:

Applicant is represented by Shri P.K. Hota, DTM, Operation, OSRTC. He stated that the vehicle in which they apply for new permit have got an existing permit which has not been surrendered. Hence, the application has no merit for consideration and rejected.

10. ROUTE - BERHAMPUR TO KOTAGADA VIA GAJALBARHI, BAIMELA AND BACK,
AKHAYA KUMAR PANIGRAHI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD07AD-9889.

Applicant Sri Akhaya Kumar Panigrahi is present.

One Shri Ranjan Kumar Choudhury told to have purchased the vehicle from previous owner, but transfer of ownership has not been effected till yet. Hence, the timing applied by the present applicant is clashing with the timing of above vehicle which he has

Q

purchased but transfer of ownership has not yet been made in his name. This is not a valid objection. Hence, this objection is not entertained.

TP may be considered subject to verification of clash free timing.

11. ROUTE - ALIMAHA TO BOLANGIR VIA GATANGI, POKHARIBANDHA AND BACK, LALIT KUMAR DIGAL, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD12A-8386.

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

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

12. ROUTE- CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) TO BALIGUDA VIA PHULABANI, TIKABALI AND BACK, UPENDRA PRADHAN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02AC-6199.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri H.P. Mohanty. He stated that he had applied to ply the vehicle on the above route as night service. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

13. ROUTE- CUTTACK TO BALIGUDA VIA NAYAGADA, DASAPALLA, PHULBANI AND BACK, UPENDRA PRADHAN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02AC-8199.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri H.P. Mohanty. He stated that he had applied to ply the vehicle on the above route as night service. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

14. ROUTE- BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO M RAMPUR VIA BHANJANAGAR, KALINGA AND BACK, RAJESWAR PATRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02AQ-7701.

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

15. ROUTE- NAYAGARH TO JEYPORE VIA MOHANA, ADAVA AND BACK, PIYUSH SHADANGI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD15G-4811.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri M.B.K. Rao. He stated that his client has applied to ply his vehicle as night service from Nayagarh. He further stated that this is alter service of SI.No.29.

There are three objections have been filed.

Shri Balaram Panigrahi, owner of vehicle No.OD07X-2599 and OD07Q-7878 is represented by Advocate K.Mahammad. He stated that in up trip, there is clash of time from Buguda to Berhampur. His 1st vehicle OD07X-2599 is departing Buguda at 16.25 and his 2nd vehicle OD07Q-7878 is departing at 16.08 hrs whereas the applicant has

Q

applied to depart Buguda at 16.19hrs. Hence the objector has requested that the applicant may be given time after his above two services. But the vehicles of objector are plying as ordinary service whereas the applicant has applied to ply his vehicle as express service.

Smt. Nalini Dalai, owner of vehicle No.OR07Y-3209 is represented by Advocate ShriH.P.Mohanty. He stated that in the down trip at Berhampur, there is clash of timing with the timing applied by the applicant. In its intermediary stoppages, the applicant has mentioned halting time of 16 minutes, 31 minutes and 07 minutes at Koraput, Sunabeda and Dmanjodi respectively. The halting time mentioned by the applicant may be reduced. But applicant stated that he may be given 45 minutes time for dinner at Damanjodi. In other stoppages, the time may be reduced at Koraput and Sunabeda to six minutes. But at Damanjodi point, more halting time may be given.

Sk. Sharif, owner of vehicle No.OR10G-6964 is represented by Advocate ShriA.K.Behera. He stated that at Koraput, the time gap is only nine minute and it is continuing upto Damanjodi. His departure time at Koraput is 16.50hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 16.41hrs.

Sk. Sharif, owner of vehicle No.OR10G-6964 is represented by Advocate ShriA.K.Behera. He has filed objection petition against the timing of vehicle No.OD17C-1511 who have applied as alter service of sl.No.15. He stated that the applicant has applied in same time issued to objector's vehicle.

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

16. ROUTE- SAMBALPUR TO DAMANJODI VIA BOLANGIR, JEYPORE AND KORAPUT AND BACK, RITA MISHRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD15J-5255.

Applicant is represented by her husband Shri Naresh Mahanty. He stated that this is alter service of OD15J-4895.

Sk. Kasim, owner of vehicle No.OD10J-3161 is represented by Advocate Shri A.K.Behera. Since the applicant has applied to ply her vehicle as alter service of OD15J-4895, the objection filed by the objector may not be considered. Hence, the objection is rejected. TP may be considered as alter service of OD15J-4895.

17. ROUTE- SOHELA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA ANGUL, DHENKANAL BYPASS AND BACK SUBHRANSHU ACHARYA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR17J-7474.

Applicant is absent. There is no objection. T.P. may be granted subject to verification of clash free timing.

18. ROUTE- BERHAMPUR TO ROURKELA VIA BOUDH, RAIKAKHOL AND BACK, PRABIR GANGA DEB, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD28-0090.

Applicant is present. Sl. No.18 and 19 are alter services. Following two objectors have filed their objections.

1. Md. Fayaz, owner of vehicle No.OD02AC-0902 is represented by Advocate Shri N.P.Panda. He stated that there is clash of time from starting point i.e. Berhampur.

His service is departing Berhampur at 5.05PM whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Berhampur at 6.00PM. This may be examined.

2. Shri Sarat Kumar Behera, owner of vehicle No.OD05N-2227 is represented by Advocate Shri A.K. Behera. He stated that there is clash of time at Berhampur. His service is departing Berhampur at 6.10PM whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at Berhampur at 6.00PM. He further stated that both of the vehicles of applicant vide sl.No.18 and 19 have been declared off-road while the applicant has applied for T.P.

This may be examined which considering T.P.

19. ROUTE- BERHAMPUR TO ROURKELA VIA BOUDH, RAIKAKHOL AND BACK, PRABIR GANGA DEB, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD28-0091.

Applicant is present. There are two objectors as mentioned in Sl.No.18 and contents of objections are same. Sl.No.18 and 19 are alter services. This may be examined.

20. ROUTE- ROURKELA TO KHURDHA VIA PALA LAHARHA, PITIRI AND BACK, SUJATA PARIJA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05AU-0881.

Applicant is represented by her husband Shri Samir Kumar Bhuyan. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time. Sl.No.20 and 21 are alter services.

21. ROUTE- ROURKELA TO KHURDHA VIA PALA LAHARHA, PITIRI AND BACK, REENA CHOUDHURY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05AU-0882.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri A.K. Behera. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time. Sl.No.20 and 21 are alter services.

22. ROUTE- CUTTACK TO KAIJHAR VIA NAYAGARH, BHANJANAG AND BACK, PRADIP KUMAR RAY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02AB-1151.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri K.C. Das. He stated that this is alter service of Sl.No.113. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

23. ROUTE- BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO TIRING VIA GHATGAON, DHENKIKOTE AND BACK, SMRUTIRANJAN MISHRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02BA-5127.

Applicant is present. He stated that this is alter service of Sl.No.27. Following objectors have filed objections.

1. Sri Dillip Karmakar, owner of vehicle No.OD11J-9990 is represented by Advocate Shri H.P. Mohanty. He stated that at Bhubaneswar, there is clash of time. His service is departing Bhubaneswar at 22.15hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 22.05hrs. which is ten minutes ahead of his service. This is continuing in whole route.

Q

Applicant stated that applied route is on different alignment than that of the alignment of the above objector. His proposed route is via Dhenkikote, Karanjia and Jashipur. But objector is plying his service from Kulasila to Bhubaneswar via Rairangpur, Baripada, Balasore, Bhadrak Panikoili, Chandikhole and Cuttack.

The common corridor is from Bhubaneswar to Panikoili.

2. Sri Ranjan Kumar Mahala, owner of vehicle No.OD11D-3792 and OD11E-3792 is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that at Tiringi and Bahalda, there is clash of time. His departure time at Tiringi and Bahalda is 20.55 hrs. and 20.30hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed at 20.05hrs. and 20.38hrs. respectively. But applicant stated that the alignment of objector's route is different.

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

24. ROUTE- KALIPADA TO BARGARH VIA PANIKOILI, CHANDIKHOLE AND BACK PUSPANJALI GAANA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD01Y-1155.

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

Following objectors have filed objections.

1. Sri R.K.Periwal, owner of vehicle No.OR01S-3987, OR01S-7187 and OD01U-7889 is represented by Advocate K.Mohammed. He stated that the above three vehicles are departing Balasore at 20.05hrs, 19.15hrs and 18.50hrs. respectively whereas the applicant has applied to depart Balasore at 19.25hrs. Hence there is clash of time at Balasore and it is continuing up to Angul and also up to Bargarh in respect of another vehicle. He further stated that the applicant has suggested clash free timing in down trip to ply just ahead from Bargarh up to Balasore which is directly clashing his first vehicle OR01S-3987. Hence the objector has requested to give timing after timings of his above three vehicles. The objector has also stated that the husband of the applicant has been granted PP. But he has not lifted the same. This may be verified.

2. Shri B.P.Das, owner of vehicle No.OR02BE-0043 is represented by Advocate Shri K.C.Das. He stated that at Balasore, the time gap is only 40 minutes. His vehicle is departing Balasore at 20.05hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart Balasore at 19.25hrs. i.e. 40 minutes ahead of his service. He further stated that at Angul, the applicant proposed to depart at 2.55AM whereas the vehicle of this objector departs 2.00AM. The applicant departs Balasore 40 minutes earlier than objector's vehicle whereas in Angul, applicant's vehicle departs 55 minutes after vehicle of this objector.

At Sambalpur, the applicant proposed to depart 2 hours 5 minutes after timing of objector's vehicle and at Baragarh the applicant's vehicle reaches two hour after the objector's vehicle. Hence, he has requested that the applicant may be given time after his service at Balasore. He further stated that the departure time of applicant at Balasore may be given two hours after the departure of his vehicle as the vehicle of applicant reaches Bargarh two hours after arrival of his vehicle.

But the Advocate appeared for the applicant stated that the time gap at Balasore is reasonable. The averments of the applicant as well as objectors may be examined.

25. ROUTE- TALCHER TO BERHAMPUR VIA PHULNAKHARA, BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) AND BACK, MOHAMED FAYAZ, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05V-9306.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri N.P.Panda. He withdrew the application. His application is rejected as withdrawn.

There is one objection filed by Shri Suresh Chandra Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OR05AR-8521 and Shri Atanu Behera, owner of vehicle No.OR07S-3069 is represented by Advocate Shri M.B.K.Rao. Since, the applicant has withdrawn his application, the objection filed by the above two objectors have no merit for consideration.

26. ROUTE- KANTABANJI TO UMARKOTE VIA KOKSARA, AMPANI AND BACK, NILAKANTHA DASH, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR08B-3039.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri J.N.Mohanty. There is no objection. Since the vehicle is more than fifteen years old, this should not be considered in inter region routes.

27. ROUTE- BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO TIRING VIA GHATGAON, DHENKIKOTE AND BACK, SMRUTIRANJAN MISHRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02AZ-5127.

Applicant is present. He stated that this is alter service of SI.No.23. There are objections which are same as mentioned in sl.no.23.

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

28. ROUTE- CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) TO LAXMIPUR VIA BALIGUDA, TUMUDIBANDHA AND BACK, ABHISEK PATRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD04A-7451.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri H.P. Mohanty. SI.No.28 and 234 are alter services.

There is one objection filed by Shri Sachitra Chhualsingh, owner of vehicle No.OR11G-5561 through Advocate Shri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that at Bhubaneswar his departure time is 21.40hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Bhubaneswar at 21.35hrs. Hence, the objector has stated that he has no objection if applicant is allowed to depart Bhubaneswar at 21.00hrs. instead of 21.35hrs. Further, the applicant may be allowed to reach Laxmipur at 10.18 hrs. Both objector and applicant have agreed to proposed timing to be given to the applicant's vehicle to depart Bhubaneswar at 21.00hrs. and to reach Laxmipur at 10.18hrs.

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

Sin

29. ROUTE- NAYAGARH TO JEYPORE VIA MOHANA, ADAVA AND BACK, PIYUSH SHADANGI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD17C-1511.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that his client has applied to ply his vehicle as night service from Nayagarh. He further stated that this is alter service of Sl.No.15.

There are three objections have been filed by the objectors as mentioned in sl.no.15. Since, the case has already been heard in sl.no.15, this may be disposed of accordingly.

30. ROUTE- BERHAMPUR TO KOTAGADA VIA KENDUGUDA, GUMUDA AND BACK, S PURNA CHANDRA PRUSTY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD07AE-1447.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri N.P. Panda.

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

31. ROUTE- HINDOL TO SAMBALPUR VIA BOINDA, NAKCHI AND BACK, PRADEEP KUMAR SAHU, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD15P-8111.

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

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

32. ROUTE- KOIRHA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA BAHADAPOSI, PALA LAHARHA AND BACK, RANJAN KUMAR NAYAK, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05X-2331.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri H.P. Mohanty. He stated that this is alter service of sl.No.33.

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

33. ROUTE- KOIRHA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA BAHADAPOSI, PALA LAHARHA AND BACK, CHATURBHUJA NAYAK, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05AF-8730.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri H.P. Mohanty. He stated that this is alter service of sl.No.32.

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

34. ROUTE- JAMSOLA TO BARBIL VIA BHANJKIA, RARUAN AND BACK, ARNAV TARVELS, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD11S-9646.

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

There is one objection filed by Shri Uttam Kumar Behera, owner of vehicle No.OD09L-8487. He stated that at Barbil, there is clash of time i.e. the departure time of both objector and applicant is at exact time at 13.00hrs. Hence he suggested that if the

applicant is allowed to depart Barbil at 12.45PM, he has no objection. Both applicant and objector are agreed to it.

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

35. ROUTE- CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) TO SRIRAMPUR VIA SHANKARKHOLE, TIKABALI AND BACK, PRADYUMNA KUMAR BARAL, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD11F-0339.

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

There is one objection filed by Sri A.K. Singh, owner of vehicle No. OD02AC-6525 through Advocate Sri M.B.K. Rao. He stated that at Sarangagada, there is clash of time. Also at Kotagada, there is clash of time. The departure time of objector's vehicle from Kotagada is at 19.05hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed at 19.08hrs. Hence, the objector has suggested to modify the departure time of applicant's vehicle from Kotagada at 19.30hrs. instead of 19.08 hrs.

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

36. ROUTE- BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO GOCHHA VIA BALIPADAR, GAHANGU AND BACK, AKHAYA KUMAR ROU TRAY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR25A-1525.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri S. Mishra.

There is an objection filed by Shri Mrutyunjaya Panigrahi, owner of vehicle No. OD07E-1907 through Advocate Shri N.P. Panda. He stated that in the return trip, there is clash of time at Balipadar and Buguda. His departure time at Balipadar is 15.00hrs. whereas applicant has proposed at 15.19hrs and there is just nineteen minutes gap. Similarly at Buguda, his departure time is 15.47hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 15.47 which is exact time. He stated that the common corridor is from Balipadar to Nayagarh which is 76 kms.

Applicant stated that the vehicle of objector is plying as ordinary service whereas he has applied to ply his vehicle as express service.

Besides, the above objector has also filed an online objection mentioning the same facts as stated above. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

37. ROUTE- CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) TO RAIGHAR VIA BOUDH, BOLANGIR AND BACK, BHARAT PRADHAN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02BH-8894.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri S. Mishra. He stated that this is alter service of sl.No.38. Both the vehicles i.e. sl. No.37 and 38 shall ply as night service.

Since the route is very lengthy i.e. 699kms and total running time is more than eighteen hours, applicant is allowed to ply his vehicle from Bhubaneswar to Raighar instead of Cuttack to Raighar. Besides, we should add Nabarngpur stoppage. Applicant is

2

agreed to delete the portion from Cuttack to Bhubaneswar. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

38. ROUTE- CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) TO RAIGHAR VIA BOUDH, BOLANGIR AND BACK, JAGABANDHU SWAIN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02BH-9488.

Since the applicant has applied to ply as alter service of sl. No.37 and the same has already been heard, this may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

39. ROUTE- BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO ROURKELA VIA TALCHER, SAMAL AND BACK, PRASANTA KUMAR PRADHAN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02BH-0064.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri S.Mishra. He stated that this is alter service of sl.No.40. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

40. ROUTE- BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO ROURKELA VIA TALCHER, SAMAL AND BACK, SOUMYA RANJAN PRADHAN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02BH-0094.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri S.Mishra. He stated that this is the alter service of sl.No.39. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

41. ROUTE- BARGARH TO PARADIP VIA DHENKANAL BYPASS, CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) AND BACK, SANTOSH KUMAR SAHU, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD35A-3669.

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

42. ROUTE- BARBIL TO IB THERMAL VIA BARKOTE, DEOGARH AND BACK, MANARANJAN SAHOO, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD09E-3663.

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

There is an objection filed by Srilata Kar, owner of vehicle No.OR05AF-0329 through his Advocate Shri S.Mishra. He stated that there is only gap of 35 minutes at Barbil and common corridor is from Barbil to Keonjhar.

The objector further stated that there is clash of time at Keonjhar, Pallahara, Deogarh and Sambalpur. The departure time gap of objector and proposed timing given by the applicant at above stoppages comes to 25 minutes, 20 minutes, 07 minutes and 08 minutes respectively.

Applicant stated that the alignment of route is different. He has applied via Champua whereas the objector's vehicle is plying via Remuli. So the objection raised by the above objector is not valid objection. Applicant further stated that objector maintains more halting time at Barbil point which may be modified.

Q.

The objector stated that applicant may be maintained 30 minutes at Keonjhar point. Objector should change his timing at Keonjhar point.

This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time and also in the observations mentioned above.

43. ROUTE- BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO ROURKELA VIA TALCHER, PALA LAHARHA AND LAXMI NARAYAN RATH BACK, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05AU-6647.

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

44. ROUTE- NTPC TO BERHAMPUR VIA DHENKANAL BYPASS, CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) AND BACK, SHASANKA SEKHAR PRADHAN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR02BP-2526.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri S.Mishra.

There is an objection filed by Shri S.C.Sahoo, owner of vehicle No.OR05AR-8521 and Shri Atanu Behera, owner of vehicle No.OR07S-3069 through their Advocate Shri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that the above two vehicles are alter service of each other. He stated that there is clash of time at Talcher. His dep. time at Talcher is 19.30hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 19.00hrs. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be given timing after his service. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time as the gap seems to be adequate for night service.

45. ROUTE- CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) TO DASAMANTHAPUR VIA DIGAPAHANDI, TAPTAPANI AND BACK, SANTOSH KUMAR SAHU, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD15H-6688.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri M.B.K. Ra o. He stated that he has applied as alter service of sl. No.189.

There is one objection filed by Sri Upendra Pradhan, owner of vehicle No.OD02AJ-8199 through Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that his departure time at Bhubaneswar is 20.50hrs. towards Rayagada whereas the applicant has applied to depart Bhubaneswar at 21.05hrs. towards Rayagada which is just 15 minutes after his service. The objector's vehicle reaches Rayagada at 7.05hrs. whereas the applicant's vehicle reaching time at Rayagada is 6.54hrs. Though applicant's proposed time at Bhubaneswar is 15 minutes after the service of objector's vehicle, but applicant reaches 11 minutes before the reaching time of objector's vehicle at Rayagada. In middle point, applicant's timing is jumping timing.

Since, the applicant has proposed to ply his vehicle from Bhubaneswar after fifteen minutes gap of objector's vehicle, this gap should be maintained.

46. ROUTE- BHANJANAGAR TO JEYPORE VIA RAYAGADA, DAMANJODI AND BACK, SUBAL PRADHAN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02S-8397.

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

Q.

47. ROUTE- CHANDILI TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA BHAWANIPATANA, BOLANGIR AND BACK, DEBASHIS JENA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02T-5127.

Applicant is present through his representative Sri Abhaya Panda.

There is one objection filed by Shri P.K.Choudhury, owner of vehicle No.OD02Y-9232 through Advocate Shri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that there is clash of time at Dasapalla and Nayagarh. His vehicle is departing Dasapalla at 6.40hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Daspalla at 6.31hrs which is nine minutes before objector's service. Similarly at Nayagarh, his service is departing at 7.45hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart at 7.40 and there is five minutes gap. The common corridor is from Dasapalla to Bhubaneswar. Hence, the objector stated that the applicant may be given ten minutes time after his service. This may be examined.

It is decided that, applicant service to start from Bhubaneswar instead of Cuttack. The portion from Cuttack to Bhubaneswar vice-versa may be deleted. His proposed timing from Dasapalla may be revised ten minutes after the service of objector. Accordingly, applicant should give a revised timing starting from Bhubaneswar instead of Cuttack. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

48. ROUTE- BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO SORADA VIA BHUTASARASINGI, GUDIALI AND BACK, RAGHUNATH BEHERA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02BJ-5810.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that his another vehicle No.OD02U-5810 is plying on the route Bhubaneswar to Nimapadar which is departing Bhubaneswar at 22.00hrs. Now he has applied for allotment of Bhubaneswar departure at 21.55hrs. ahead of his existing vehicle and route to avoid any clash of timings.

There is one objection filed by Sri Sarangadhar Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OD02AP-1214 through Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. He stated that in down trip at Keshpur, there is clash of time. His service is departing Kespur at 12.00hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Kespur at 11.55hrs. which is just five minutes ahead of his service. The common corridor is from Kespur to Bhubaneswar. Hence, he requested to allow the applicant to depart Kespur after his service.

Applicant is agreed to depart Kespur at 12.05hrs. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

49. ROUTE- BARBIL TO IB THERMAL VIA BARKOTE, DEOGARH AND BACK, SAUDAMINI DORA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD15H-6888.

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

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

50. ROUTE- NABARANGPUR TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA LAXMIPUR, RAYAGADA AND BACK, JYOTI RANJAN PARIDA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD10E-6555.

Applicant is present. He stated that this is alter service of sl.No.51. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

51. ROUTE- NABARANGPUR TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA LAXMIPUR, RAYAGADA AND BACK, JYOTI RANJAN PARIDA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD10G-6555.

Applicant is present. He stated that this is alter service of sl.No.50. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

52. ROUTE- ROURKELA TO PURI VIA PALA LAHARHA, PITIRI AND BACK, RASHMI RANJAN JENA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD33Z-9599.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri S.Mishra. He stated that the applicant has applied T.P. as alter service of sl.No.54.

There is one objection filed by Sri S.K.Behera, owner of vehicle No.OD05X-2227 through his Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. He stated that at Rourkela starting point the time gap is only fifteen minutes. His service is departing Rourkela at 21.00hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Rourkela at 20.45hrs. which is fifteen minutes ahead of objector's service. Hence he requested that the applicant may be given departure time at 20.30hrs from Rourkela. Both applicant and objector are agreed to it.

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

53. ROUTE- KANCHANA TO BURLA VIA PHULABANI, CHARICHHAK AND BACK, CHITRASEN NAYAK, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR22B-6405.

Applicant is present.

There is no objection. TP may be considered subject to verification of clash free timings. Since, this is 2007 model vehicle, TP may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

54. ROUTE- ROURKELA TO PURI VIA PALA LAHARHA, PITIRI AND BACK, RASHMI RANJAN JENA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD33Z-9799.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri S.Mishra. He stated that the applicant has applied T.P. as alter service of sl.No.52.

This has already been heard in sl. No.52 and observation made there i.e. in sl.No.52 may be taken into consideration.

55. ROUTE- ASKA TO INDRAVATI VIA RAYAGADA, KORAPUT AND BACK RANJAN KUMAR SAHU, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD03-9188.

Applicant is present. He stated that he has applied for TP as alter service of sl.No.57. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

9

56. ROUTE- LOHARCHHATI TO VUTTACK VIA BOUDH, CHARICHHAK AND BACK, NIRANJAN SUNDARAY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02AE-4199.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that he has applied for TP as alter service of vehicle No.OR02BV-0099.

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

57. ROUTE- ASKA TO INDRAVATI VIA RAYAGADA, KORAPUT AND BACK, ASHOK KUMAR SAHU, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02S-8396.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri A.K.Behera. He stated that this is alter service of sl.No.55. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

58. ROUTE- ATTABIRA TO JEYPORE VIA SONEPUR, SIMILIGUDA AND BACK, SUDHIRA BEHERA OD22A-5323.

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

59. ROUTE- CUTTACK TO BALIMELA VIA BERHAMPUR AND BACK, ANIL KUMAR SINGH, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD23F-0488.

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

There is no objection. Since the vehicle has been proposed it's running time 18 hours continuously, it is decided to delete the portion from Bhubaneswar to Cuttack in both trips. This may be considered after verification of clash free time and deleting the portion from Bhubaneswar to Cuttack in both the trips.

60. ROUTE- CUTTACK TO BALIMELA VIA BERHAMPUR AND BACK, ANIL KUMAR SINGH, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD15N-7988.

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

There is no objection. Since the vehicle has been proposed its running time 18 hours continuously, applicant may delete the portion from Bhubaneswar to Cuttack in both the side. This may considered after verification of clash free time and deleting the portion from Bhubaneswar to Cuttack from both sides. The vehicle shall start from Bhubaneswar instead of Cuttack.

61. ROUTE- KANTAPALI TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA TALCHER, BANRAPAL AND BACK, PADMABATI BHUYAN OD05AV-0224.

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

62. ROUTE- CUTTACK TO RAYAGADA VIA BALUGAON, BERHAMPUR AND BACK, AMLAN GOURAB, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02C-8810.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri A.K.Behera. He stated that the applicant has applied TP as alter service of OD02C-8710. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

63. ROUTE- CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) TO GUNUPUR VIA BERHAMPUR, PADMAPUR AND BACK, NIRANJAN SUNDARAY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02BL-0599.

Applicant is represented by Advocate K. Mohammad. He stated that he has applied to operate his vehicle as alter service of sl.No.64.

There is one objection filed by Jagyaseni Mohapatra, owner of vehicle No.OD02AF-9736 and Sri P.C.Mohapatra, owner of vehicle No. OD02AF-9735 though Advocate Shri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that the service of objector departs Cuttack at 20.30hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 20.20hrs. just ten minutes ahead of his service. Similarly, at Gunupur, the objector's vehicle is departing at 21.00hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 20.50hrs. which is just ten minutes ahead of his service. Hence, he requested that in both the sides i.e. Cuttack and Gunupur, the applicant may be given ten minutes time after his service. The objector further stated that if there is a place at Padmapur near Berhampur, he has no objection. The alignment of route from Padmapur to Gunupur may be checked.

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

64. ROUTE- CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) TO GUNUPUR VIA BERHAMPUR, PADMAPUR AND BACK, PRATYUSHA KUMAR PARIDA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02BL-0699.

Applicant is represented by Advocate K. Mohammad. He stated that he has applied to operate his vehicle as alter service of sl.No.63.

The objections given in sl.no.63 are same. It may be considered at par with observations given in sl.No.63.

65. ROUTE- NAYAGARH TO PAPADAHANDI VIA RAYAGADA, DAMANJODI AND BACK, SANJIT KUMAR PATI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD07D-1440.

Applicant is present.

The following objectors have filed their objections:

1. S. Reena Prusty, owner of vehicle No.OD07K-5888 and Nalini Dalai, owner of vehicle No.OR07Y-3209 are represented by Advocate M.B.K. Rao. He stated that there is clash of time at Berhampur. The objectors vehicles are departing Berhampur at 4.40 hrs. and 4.05hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Berhampur at 4.39hrs. just one minute ahead of vehicle No.OD07K-5888. Similarly, the vehicle of objector Nalini Dalai i.e. OR07Y-3207 is departing Berhampur at 4.05hrs. whereas the applicant has

proposed at 4.39hrs. just after gap of 34minutes. Common corridor is from Berhampur to Nayagarh.

The objection given by objector Nalini Dalai is not acceptable as her service is departing Berhampur at 4.05hrs. where as applicant has proposed at 4.39hrs. which is 34 minutes gap after the service of this objector.

2. There is another objection given by S Reena Prusty, owner of vehicle No.OR12A-4242 through Advocate ShriM.B.K.Rao. He stated that at Papadahandi, there is clash of time. The objector's vehicle is departing Papadahandi at 16.21hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 16.20hrs. which is only one minute ahead of the service of objector. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be allowed to depart Papadahandi after thirty minutes of her service i.e. at 16.50hrs. The common corridor is Nayagarh to Aska.

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

66. ROUTE- BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO CHANDILI VIA BOLANGIR, BHAWANIPATANA AND BACK, DEBABRATA PATNAIK, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02R-7097.

Applicant is present and stated that this is alter service of sl.No.67. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

67. ROUTE- BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO CHANDILI VIA BOLANGIR, BHAWANIPATANA AND BACK, DEBABRATA PATNAIK, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02R-7297.

Applicant is present and stated that this is alter service of sl.No.66.

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

68. ROUTE- NAYAGARH TO RAJGANGPUR VIA LATHIKATA, PANPOSH AND BACK, BICHITRA RANJAN BEHERA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR02BV-8188.

Applicant is present. He stated that he has applied as alter service of sl.No.69.

One objection is filed by Shri P.K.Pattnaik, Depo Manager, OSRTC, Rourkela. He stated that they are operating two vehicles bearing No.OR14M-2027 and OR14M-2037 which departure time from Rourkela is 20.00hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart Rourkela at 19.25hrs. which is 35 minutes ahead of their service. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be given time after their service from Rourkela at 20.25hrs. instead of 19.25hrs. in return trip and at Nayagarh point, applicant may be allowed to ply his vehicle after the service of OSRTC.

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

69. ROUTE- NAYAGARH TO RAJGANGPUR VIA LATHIKATA, PANPOSH AND BACK, BICHITRA RANJAN BEHERA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR17H-9855.

Applicant is present. He stated that he has applied as alter service of sl.No.68.The observations made in sl.No.68 may be followed.

70. ROUTE- PURI MUNICIPALTY BUS STAND TO BOLANGIR VIA NAYAGARH, DASHAPALLA AND BACK, SUNIL KUMAR MEHER, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD31G-4367.

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

71. ROUTE- CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) TO GARABANDHA VIA DIGAPAHANDI, LUHAGUDI AND BACK, DEEPAK KUMAR SAMANTRAY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02AA-3801.

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

72. ROUTE- BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO GANDHINAGAR VIA POLASARA, GOLIA AND BACK, RAJENDRA KUMAR BEHERA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02AN-6802.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri S. Mishra.

There is an objection filed by Sri B.N.Sahoo, owner of vehicle No. OR02BU-0320 through Advocate Shri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that at Polasara, the applicant has applied seven minutes after the timing of his service. Objector stated that his service is departing Polasara at 11.40hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 11.47hrs. Similarly, the departure time of objector's vehicle at Khalikote and Balugaon is 13.00hrs. and 13.47hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart above two points at 12.49hrs. and 13.25hrs. which is just eleven minutes and twenty-two minutes ahead of his service. The total route is common corridor. Objector further stated that if permit granted to the applicant as per proposed timing, it will result in jumping as well as clash of timings.

Applicant stated that he has applied to ply his service as express service, whereas the vehicle of objector is plying as ordinary service. It is observed that since the applicant has applied to ply as express service and service of objector is plying as ordinary service, naturally the vehicle of the applicant shall overtake the service of objector in middle point.

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

73. ROUTE- KALIPADA TO BALASORE VIA KUNDALI, SOLAPATA AND BACK, GANESH CHANDRA JENA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD01N-8882.

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

Q.

74. ROUTE- DAMANJODI TO JHARIGAM VIA BORIGUMMA, NABARANGPUR AND BACK, JYOTI RANJAN PARIDA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02C-3099.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri A.K. Behera. He withdrew the application by way of filling of withdrawal petition. His application is rejected.

75. ROUTE- NTPC TO DEOGARH VIA KANTABAHAL, TINKBIR AND BACK, JAYAKRISHNA SATPATHY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD28-9059.

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

76. ROUTE- BERHAMPUR TO KATAMA VIA LUHAGUDI, MOHANA AND BACK, SANKAR MANDALO, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR01J-0203.

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

There is an objection filed by Sri Prithviraj Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OD07X-2999 through Advocate K. Mahammad. He stated that at Berhampur, there is clash of timing. His service is departing Berhampur at 7.20hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 7.05. Hence he requested that the applicant may be given time to leave Berhampur at 7.00hrs. instead of 7.05hrs. Both objector and applicant are agreed to it.

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

77. ROUTE- BOLANGIR TO BARGARH VIA DUNGURIPALI, BARPALI AND BACK, SANTOSH KUMAR PUROHIT, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD03F-0028.

Applicant is absent. There is no objection. T.P. may be granted subject to verification of clash free timing.

78. ROUTE- KURUMKEL TO LAIDA VIA DHARUADIHI, BAMURA AND BACK, AJAY KUMAR XAXA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR15P-6595.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri B.N. Prasad.

There is an objection filed by Sabita Purohit, owner of vehicle No.OD16D-7555 through her husband ShriS.S.Purohit. He stated that there is clash of time from Sundargarh to Bamara. Her departure time at Sundargarh is 8.15hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Sundargarh at 8.00hrs. According to objector, out of total route length 150kms., the common corridor portion from Sundargarh to Bamra is 50 kms. But according to applicant, out of total length of route 162kms., the common corridor portion is 50 kms. Hence, the objector requested that gap should be maintained from Sundargarh to Bamra.

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

79. ROUTE- BAMDERA TO ROURKELA VIA TUDALAGA, KUTRA AND BACK, MD ZAHIR, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR16B-8821.

Q

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri Santanu Das. Following objectors have raised their objections:

1. Sri S.K.Sharma, owner of vehicle No.OD16A-4655 is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that this is rationalized route. He stated that applicant has applied on a route which covers 72kms of the rationalized route Rourkela to Sundargarh which is 104 kms. Further, he stated that at Rourkela point, the proposed timing given by the applicant is directly clashing with the timing of his vehicle. His departure time at Rourkela is 8.46hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to leave at 8.45hrs. which is just one minutes ahead of his service. Further, he stated that the applicant has applied to leave Rajagangpur at 7.18hrs. whereas there are two vehicles plying whose departure times at Rajagangpur is 7.14hrs. and 7.22hrs as per rationalized timing. Similarly, the applicant has proposed to depart Rourkela at 15.10hrs. towards Tudalaga and there is a service at 15.06 and another service at 15.12 with a gap of only six minutes in the rationalized route. In this regard, he requested that applicant may not be granted TP on the applied route as per the timings given by the applicant as this is rationalized route.

2. Sabita Rout, owner of vehicle No.OD14F-2698 is represented by Advocate Shri H.P. Mohanty. He stated that at Rajgangpur, there is clash of time. The objector's service is departing Rajgangpur at 7.22hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 7.18hrs. which is just four minutes ahead of her service. Moreover, the route from Bamdera to Rourkela is covering 70% of the rationalized route Sundrgarh to Rourkela. In this regard, he requested that applicant may not be granted TP on the applied route as per the timings given by the applicant as the route is covering rationalised route.

3. Sri P.K.Swain, Managing Partner, SAMPARK is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that there is a Bus bearing No.OD14F-7180 belongs to Sundargarh Urban Transport Trust (SUTT) is plying on the route Rajgangpur to Rourkela and back. His departure time at Rajaganpur is at 13.30hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Rajagangpur at 13.23hrs. just seven minutes ahead of his service. Similarly, his departure time at Rourkela is at 15.15hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 15.10hrs. just five minutes ahead of his service.

4. There is an online objection filed by Shrilndrajeet Singh, owner of vehicle No.OD16-3697. He has stated that there is clash of time at Ekma. His service is departing Ekma at 5.35hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 5.34hrs. which is just one minute ahead of his service.

Applicant stated that he is willing to depart 5 minutes after any service in case any objector claims priority of timing. This may be examined.

80. ROUTE- SAI TEMPLE TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) AND BACK,
BIRENDRA KUMAR SWAIN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR02AH-6890.

Applicant is present. This is an old model vehicle i.e. 1/2005 which has already covered more than fifteen years. This may not be considered in inter region route.

Q,

81. ROUTE- KARLAGHATI TO NABARANGPUR VIA RAYAGADA, LAXMIPUR AND BACK, K URMILA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD10A-6957.

Applicant is represented by her husband Mr. K. Bhujanga Rao. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

82. ROUTE- UDALA TO DHAMARA VIA SORO, JAMJHADI AND BACK, DIPTIMUDRA ROUT, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR22A-9311.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri S. Mishra. Two objections have been filed by the following objectors.

1. Shri S.S.Behera, owner of vehicle No.OR04H-0267and Barsharani Palai, owner of vehicle No.OD09-0888 is represented by Advocate Shri A.K.Behera. He stated that in the down trip, there is clash of time at Dhamara in respect of timing of vehicle No.OR04H-0267. His departure time at Dhamara is 14.30hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 14.20hrs. which is ten minutes ahead of his service. Similarly in up trip at Sergada, the applicant has proposed ahead of the another service of objector bearing vehicle No.OD09-0888.

In this regard, applicant is willing for modification of time at Dhamara at 14.10hrs. instead of 14.20hrs. Accordingly, all timings be modified.

Advocate appeared for the objector stated that if modification of time of applicant is made, they have no objection.

Besides, there is an objection filed by the above objector mentioning the same objection.

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

83. ROUTE- SALANGABAHAL TO BIRMITRAPUR BORDER VIA BIRMITRAPUR, ROURKELA AND BACK, SAROJ KUMAR SAHOO, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR14Q-4654.

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

Following objectors have raised their objections through Shri H.P. Mohanty, Advocate.

1. Sri H.B.Nayak, owner of vehicle No.OR14S-9577.
2. M.D., Sundargarh Urban Transport Trust, vehicle No.OD14G-2822.
3. M.D., Sundargarh Urban Transport Trust, vehicle No.OD14G-2829.
4. Shri Batia Lakra, owner of vehicle No.OD14G-9559.
5. Shri Anand Viswakarma, owner of vehicle No.OD14S-6394.

Advocate Shri H.P. Mohanty stated that the route applied by the applicant is single region route in which concerned RTA can issue permit. Hence the applicant is advised to apply before the concerned RTO i.e. RTO, Rourkela. His application is rejected.

84. ROUTE- JHARSUGUDA TO RENGALI VIA BHUSAN, LAPANGA AND BACK, RAJANI BARMA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD23D-4563.

Applicant is absent. Since the vehicle is 25 seated, this could not be considered by STA. Hence, rejected.

85. ROUTE- JEYPORE TO GUNUPUR VIA LAXMIPUR, RAPKONA AND BACK, BIKRAM KUMAR MOHANTY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD33C-8299.

Applicant is absent. Sri Pravakar Behera, Advocate for Pradip Kumar Parida, owner of vehicle OD10E3610 has filed objection and states that 30 minutes gap may be given between two services at Jeypore and Gunupur after objector's service.

86. ROUTE- BALUGAON TO JANHIKUDA VIA RAMBHA, PALURU AND BACK, PRASAN KUMAR SETHI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02BF-1132.

Applicant is absent. There is no objection. T.P. may be granted after verification of clash free timing.

87. ROUTE- KEONJHAR TO SAMBALPUR VIA BALLAM, DEOGARH AND BACK, PADMINI SAHU, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD15J-3811.

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

There is an objection filed by Sri Kusadev Panda, owner of vehicle No.OD14N-8811 through Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that there is clash of time at Palalahada. The Palalahada timing may be modified to 8.20hrs. instead of 8.13hrs. Both objector and applicant are agreed to it.

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

88. ROUTE- JHARSUGUDA TO CHANTIPALI VIA NUABANDHA, KADAMDIHI AND BACK, RAJENDRA KUMAR KAR, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD15H-5655.

Applicant is absent. There is no objection. T.P. may be granted after verification of clash free timing.

89. ROUTE- SRIRAMPUR TO CHARICHHAK VIA BATAGUDA, BALIGUDA AND BACK, MANAS RANJAN PRADHAN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD12-5352.

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

There is one objection raised by Shri J.B. Samal, Unit In-Charge, OSRTC, Phulbani and stated that the timing proposed by the applicant is clashing with the timing of their vehicle No.OD12-7029. He stated that at Baliguda, applicant has applied after their service. He requested that the applicant may be given time after their service. Both objector and applicant are agreed that timing of OSRTC may be revised as per OPMS time.

Q

90. ROUTE- PARADIP TO PURI MUNICIPALTY BUS STAND VIA SHIKHAR, JOGESHWARPUR AND BACK, BASANTI SETHY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD29G-5547.

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 (slot 6 and slot 80).

91. ROUTE- NARAYANPATNA TO GUNUPUR VIA RAYAGADA, RAMANAGUDA AND BACK, K SATYABATI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD18C-1269.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri A.K. Behera. Since the vehicle is more than 15 years, it could not be considered and rejected.

92. ROUTE- KISINDA TO ANGUL VIA RAIPAL, BAGEDIA AND BACK, RAHUL SAMAL, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR19L-7457.

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

93. ROUTE- PARADIP TO GOCHHA VIA NAYAGARH, BHANJANAGAR AND BACK, SMT KUNU MOHANTY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD08-5818.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri S.Mishra. He stated that this is alter service of sl.No.372.

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

94. ROUTE- KHILOLI TO JEYPORE VIA DABUGAM, PAPADAHANDI AND BACK, NARENDRA KUMAR MOHANTY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD10N-3296.

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

There is an objection filed by Sri S.K.Padhi, owner of vehicle No.OR10F-2788 through Advocate Shri A.K.Behera. He stated that earlier, he has obtained the said permit. Due to some personal difficulties, he could not ply his vehicle and the vehicle in whose favour the PP was issued has been declared off-road. In the meantime, the applicant has applied TP on the said route. This may be verified. He further stated that now the P.P. is not valid. This is required to be notified by the STA. Hence, he requested that the application of the applicant may not be entertained as the vacant route has not been notified.

As the objector vehicle is off road for more than 3 years, commuting public is suffering. T.P. is to be considered subject to clash free timing.

95. ROUTE- CHILIKHAMA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA ODAGAON, SHARANKULA AND BACK, SRIDHAR PRADHAN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD25J-5352.

Applicant is present.

There is one objection filed by Nalini Prava Mishra, owner of vehicle No.OR02BH-8487 through her brother in law Shri Bijay Kumar Mishra. He stated that at Kural, the time gap is only 18 minutes. His departure time at Kural is 5.45hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 5.27hrs. He further stated that there is one more service plying on the route

Q.

which dep. time at Kurala is 4.44hrs. Hence, he requested that the applicant's departure time at Kurala may be revised to 5.00hrs. instead of 5.27hrs.

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

96. ROUTE- ROURKELA TO TARANGA VIA KANSABAHAL CHHAK, KUCHINDA AND BACK, SWARANIKA DANI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD28A-9129.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri Satrugna Dash(A). There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

97. ROUTE- SILET TO BHAWANIPATANA VIA SAGBARI, GUNUPUR AND BACK, MADHUBAN NAIK, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR08C-6855.

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

98. ROUTE- JHARSUGUDA TO SUNDARGARH VIA BELPAHAR AND KUNDEIKELA, SURENDRA KUMAR SAHU, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD23A-8119.

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

99. ROUTE- BALIPATA TO SONEPUR VIA BARGARH, BARPALI AND BACK, SUSHANTA DISHREE, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD17S-3219.

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


100. ROUTE- NAYAGARH TO BERHAMPUR VIA BUGUDA, BALIPADAR AND BACK, PRADEEP KUMAR MOHANTY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR02AZ-0784.

Applicant is present.

There is an objection filed by Shri R.C.Padhy, owner of vehicle No.OR12-7707. He stated that at Berhampur, there is clash of time. His departure time at Berhampur is 16.55hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Berhampur at 16.15hrs. Since, the applicant has applied forty minutes gap time from the time of objector, this objection is not genuine.

Besides, there is one online objection filed by Sri Mrutyunjaya Panigrahi, owner of vehicle No.OD07L-1907. He stated that there is clash of time at Nayagarh. Hence he requested that the applicant may be given after his service.

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


 3.4.2020
 Transport Commissioner-Cum-Chairman,
 S.T.A., Odisha, Cuttack.