

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 16TH, MARCH, 2020.

201. ROUTE- KESRAMAL TO ROURKELA VIA KANSABAHAL , VEDVYAS AND BACK, SANJEEB KUMAR PATRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OR14U-7842.

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

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

202. ROUTE- BOLANI TO KARANJIA VIA JODA , CHAMPUA AND BACK, JOGENDRA PRUSTY, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OR11J-1905.

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

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

203. ROUTE- BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA RASULGARH , PHULNAKHARA AND BACK, BARADA PRASANA ACHARYA, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OR02Z-0464

Applicant is absent. Since the vehicle is seventeen years old, it is not to be considered in inter region route.

204. ROUTE- KALAMPUR TO JEYPORE VIA AMPANI , MAIDALPUR AND BACK, BISWANATH RATH, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. AP02X-9126.

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

Since the vehicle is other state Registration vehicle, this case is not to be considered.

205. ROUTE- CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) TO CHIKITI VIA KHALIKOTE CHHAKA , PURUSHOTTAMPUR AND BACK, SARANGADHAR SAHOO, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO OD02AF-1687.

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

There is an objection filed by Sri Askhya Pattnaik, owner of vehicle No.OD02AN-5435 through Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated his service is departing Bhubaneswar at 6.15hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave at 6.10hrs. which is just five minutes ahead of his service. There is common corridor from Bhubaneswar to Balugaon which is 100 kms. Hence he requested that the applicant may be allowed to depart from Bhubaneswar after his service.

Applicant and objector agreed to depart from Bhubaneswar at 6.20hrs. instead of 6.10hrs. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

206. ROUTE- BARHAGADA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA PURUSHOTTAMPUR , BANIA AND BACK, SATYA NARAYAN PANDA, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OR02AR-6499

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

There is an objection filed by Sri S.Sahoo, owner of vehicle No.OD02AH-0754 through Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that his service is departing Sergarh at 6.15hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 6.00hrs. which is fifteen minutes ahead of his service.

Applicant stated that alignment of proposed route is separate. But the above objector stated that alignment is same. He further stated that actual distance from Balugaon to Chandpur is 31kms. but the applicant has mentioned the distance as it is 78kms. To cover the distance of 31 kms., applicant has proposed timing near about two hours which is not proper. Hence, the objector stated that gap at Sergada may be maintained 30-40 minutes. He suggested that applicant may be given departure time at 5.50hrs. from Sergada. Applicant agreed to it.

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

207. ROUTE- HURMAI TO ROURKELA VIA DEOGAON , SINGARMUNDA AND BACK, NIRANJAN SINHA, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD16G-3702.

Applicant is absent.

There is no objection. T.P. to be considered subject to verification of clash free timing.

208. ROUTE- KANTABANJI TO KHARIAR VIA BANGOMUNDA , BHALUMUNDA AND BACK, AKASH MISHRA OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD03Q-9493.

Applicant is present.

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

209. ROUTE- LAIMURA TO ANGUL VIA DHUBALIPATHAR , KHILEI AND BACK, SHIBAJEE PRADHAN, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD19R-2687.

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

There is an objection filed by Sri S.K.Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OD19F-4796 through Advocate Sri S.Mishra. He stated that in up trip his departure time from Angul is 12.45hrs. whereas the applicant has applied in exact timing to leave Angul. Similarly, in the third up trip at from Angul to Chhendipadaa which is 41 kms, the proposed timing given by the applicant is clashing with the timing of this objector. The objector suggested that the applicant may be given to leave Angul at 12.25hrs. and applicant agreed to it.

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

210. ROUTE- BARBIL TO ROURKELA VIA K BALANG , LAHUNIPARA AND BACK, ALAM KHAN, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OR14W-2774.

Applicant is present.

There is an objection filed by S. Begum, owner of vehicle No.OR14S-2063 through Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that from Koida, her departure time is 10.10hrs. whereas applicant has applied to leave at 10.00hrs. which is ten minutes ahead of objector's service. Clash of time is continuing upto Rourkela. Accordingly, applicant has submitted a revised timing mentioning the dep. time from Barbil at 7.35hrs. Koida-9.10hrs. Both the parties agreed to it.

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

211. ROUTE- ATTABIRA TO JEYPORE VIA SONEPUR, SIMILIGUDA AND BACK, SUDHIRA BEHERA, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD15G-2395

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. He stated that this is alter service of OD22A-5323.

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

212. ROUTE- NILADRIPRASAD TO PHULNAKHARA VIA NACHUNI , KUHUDI AND BACK, AKSHMIDHAR KHUNTIA, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD02AV-2429.

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

There is an objection filed by Sasmita Patnaik, owner of vehicle No.OD02A-5707 and OD02A-0022 through Advocate Sri P.K.Behera. He stated that at Banpur, her service departing at 6.42hrs. whereas

the applicant has proposed to depart at 6.55hrs. just thirteen minutes after her service. Since the proposed time given by the applicant is after the service of objector from Banapur, but the applicant is overtaking his vehicle in middle point.

Similarly at Bhubaneswar point, the departure time of objector's another vehicle i.e. OD02A-0022 there is just five minutes gap. The dep. time from Bhubaneswar of this vehicle is 11.09hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to leave at 11.20hrs. Hence he requested that applicant may be given ten minutes after her service from Bhubaneswar.

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

213. ROUTE- MARDAKOTA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA BANPUR , BALUGAON AND BACK, CHITTARANJAN PAIKARAY, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD02AV-2131.

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

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Smt. Sabitri Pattnaik, owner of vehicle No.OD02A-9237 is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that at Tangi, her departure time is 5.38 whereas the applicant has applied to leave at 5.28hrs. just ten minutes ahead of her service. From Bhubaneswar towards Balugaon, the departure time of this objector's vehicle is 7.50hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to leave Bhubaneswar at 7.42hrs. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be given after her service.
2. Sri Sarangdhar Sahoo, owner of vehicle No.OR02W-4677 is represented by Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. He stated that his service is departing Angargaon at 4.15hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to leave at 3.59 hrs which is sixteen minutes ahead of his service. The common corridor is from Angargaon to Bhubaneswar. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be given time after his service from Angargaon.
3. Sri B.S.Singh Deo, owner of vehicle No.OD02AH-7003 stated that at Bhubaneswar, his service is departing 7.45hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart at 7.42hrs. which is just three minutes ahead of his service. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be given time after his service from Bhubaneswar.



4. Sujata Pattnaik, owner of vehicle No.OD02C-7777 stated that her service is departing Bhubaneswar at 15.30hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Bhubaneswar at 15.35hrs. which is five minutes after of her service. At Janla, the proposed timing given by the applicant is overtaking her service.

5. Samarendra Pattnaik, owner of vehicle No.OD02BE-9329 stated that, his service is departing from Balugaon at 11.56hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 12.01hrs i.e. after five minutes of his service. Since the applicant has proposed to depart Balugaon after five minutes of the service of this objector, but it overtakes his service at Sunakhala point. Besides, applicant has not mentioned the stoppage at Sunakhala. He also stated that at Nachuni, there is also clash of time. The service proposed by the applicant is from Mardakota to Bhubaneswar which is 144 kms. Hence, he requested that the inter trip applied by the applicant may be deleted.

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

214. ROUTE- CHHAMUNDIA TO PURI VIA BHAPUR , KALAPATHARA AND BACK, PREMJJIT LALA, OD02AV-2199.

Applicant is present.

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

215. ROUTE- NAKSARA TO BAMEBARI VIA KESNA , CHADHEIBHOL AND BACK, SINGHADRI BIHARI SAHU, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD14-E-0979.

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

There is an objection filed by Sabita Behera, owner of vehicle No.OD15N-6222 through Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. He stated that the vehicle of this objector is departing Chandikhola at 7.08hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave at 7.29hrs. which is twenty one minutes after her service. Since the time gap is sufficient i.e. 21 minutes, between the objector's time and proposed timing of applicant, the objection raised by this objector is not valid.

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

216. ROUTE- PIKARALI TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA DELTA COLLEGE , TARATA AND BACK, RASHMIREKHA SAHOO, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OR18A-4883.

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

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Sri Amarendra Bhuyan, owner of vehicle No.OR02AZ-4106 is represented by Advocate Sri S.Mishra. He stated that in the first trip, from Pikarali towards Cuttack timing applied for by applicant will clash with the timing of his service from Buspur to Danpur with a gap of 14 minutes gap at Danpur. Besides, in the 1st down trip from Cuttack, the applicant has applied to depart at 8.30hrs. whereas his timing is 8.32 just two minutes ahead of his service. Besides, this objector stated that the route applied by the applicant is not at all feasible for plying of buses which is canal road.

2. Sri P.K.Mishra, owner of vehicle No.OR05AB-3195 is represented by Advocate Sri S.Mishra. He stated that there is clash of time at Rankalo. His departure time from Rankalo is 5.40hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 5.14 which is 26 minutes ahead of his service. Since, the applicant proposed to depart Rankalo in 26 minutes gap, but at Tarata, the time gap is comes down to seven minutes. This may be verified and time gap may be increased.

3. Sri J.K.Sahu, power of attorney holder of Mrs.S.Nayak, owner of vehicle No.OR05AC-5323 stated that the applicant has applied in same slot i.e. slot No.154 category-A from Cuttack which has been allotted to her service. As per the rationalisation timing of above slot, the service of this objector is departing Cuttack at 16.00hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart Cuttack at 16.00hrs. He further stated that applicant had obtained a TP in the year 1998 and plying in canal route.

Applicant stated that he has not applied in any rationalisation route or slot which may be verified.

217. ROUTE- MUNIGUDA TO PHULABANI VIA K.NUAGAM , DHARAMPUR AND BACK, MANAS RANJAN PRADHAN, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD12A-8675.

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

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

218. ROUTE- BELAGUNTHA TO POLASARA VIA BALIPADAR , PANGIDI AND BACK, PADMANAVA BEHERA, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OR02AP-7458.

Applicant is absent. (Later applicant is present).

There is an objection filed by Sri R.K.Padhy, owner of vehicle No.OR07V-1199. He stated that his service is departing Belaguntha at 7.25hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 6.20hrs. The proposed service of applicant is coming from Belaguntha to Bhanjanagar and against Bhanjanagar to Mangalpur.

It may not be considered. If applicant will submit a revised route and timing, then it may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

Besides, applicant has not mentioned the timing at Belaguntha between Bhanjanagar.

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

219. ROUTE- CHAMPUA TO BHADRAK VIA DHENKIKOTE , GHATGAON AND BACK, GEETANJALI BEHERA OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD09R-4080.

Applicant is represented by her husband Sri Sanjay Kumar Behera.

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Sri A.C.Barik, owner of vehicle No.OR09R-3619 stated that his service is plying between Keonjhar to Ghatagaon. At Keonjhar, his service is departing at 8.45hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 8.35hrs. which is ten minutes ahead of his service. Applicant's proposed halting time at Keonjhar is fifty minutes which may be reduced. He has requested that the applicant may be allowed to depart Keonjhar after 10 minutes of his service.

2. Sri P.C.Kar, owner of vehicle No.OR22A-5207 is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that at Anandpur, there is clash of time. His service is departing Anandpur at 11.05hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart at 11.05hrs. which is same. The common corridor is from Anandpur to Keonjhar.

3. Smt. N.Das, owner of vehicle No.OR13F-7877 is represented by her father-in-law Sri R.K.Das. He stated that at Bhadrakh, there is clash of time. His departure time at Bhadrakh is 14.00hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 14.00hrs. which is same. On verification of timings given by the applicant, it is ascertained that the vehicle of applicant will reach Bhadrakh at 12.34hrs. and leave at 14.45hrs. It may be verified.

4. Smt N.Das, owner of vehicle No.OR13F-7877 stated that there is clash of time at Bhadrak. Her service is departing Bhadrakh towards Badbil at 14.00hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart Bhadrakh at 14.05hrs. But as per the timings proposed by the applicant, it is seen that the applicant has proposed to depart Bhadrakh at 14.45hrs.

Applicant stated that he has submitted a revised timing which may be verified.

220. ROUTE- UDALA TO UADAYPUR VIA BALASORE , JALESWAR AND BACK, DEBABRATA SAHU, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD01C-0147.

Applicant is present. Since the vehicle of the applicant is fifteen years old, this should not be considered. The permit was earlier in the name of Sri P.K.Swain.

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Sri N.B.Das, owner of vehicle No.OD01A-3898 is represented by Advocate Shri D.B.Das and Associates. He stated that his departure time at Udala is 6.30hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart at 6.15hrs. which is fifteen minutes ahead of his service. The common corridor is from Udala to Balasore.

As stated by the applicant, the nature of service is different and the route alignment is also different.

2. Sri K.K.Das, owner of vehicle No.OR01Q-1404 is represented by Advocate Sri J.N.Mohanty. He stated that at Udala, his service is departing at 6.05hs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 6.15hr. which is ten minutes after his service. Since, there is no vehicle between 6.30 to 8.15, applicant may be given time between the above vacant time. Applicant stated that the service of this objector is plying as ordinary service whereas he has applied to ply his service as express service.

221.ROUTE- BIRAMAHAJAPUR TO JAMUDOLI VIA KIAKATA , KANDAPARHA AND BACK, BIKASH MISHRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OR19E-2758.

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

There is an objection filed by Sri S.K.Das, owner of vehicle No.OR19H-5571. He stated that his service is departing Boudh at 8.10hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart at 7.51hrs. which is nineteen minutes ahead of his service. The common corridor is from Boudh to Kadaligarh which is 16 kms. And from Boudh to Jamudoli which is 62kms. Hence, he has requested that applicant may be given time after his service.

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

222.ROUTE- ROURKELA TO GURUNDIA VIA BIRKERA , BIRIDA AND BACK, RAJESH SINHA, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OR14M-5781.

Applicant is present. Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Md. Maksud Alam, owner of vehicle No.OR14T-9236 is represented by Advocate Sri B.N.Prasad. He stated that he is operating his vehicle on the PP issued by RTA, Rourkela and the timing has been entered in OPMS.
2. Sri Biswajit Sarkar, owner of vehicle No.OR14W-9715 is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that his service is departing Rourkela at 12.50hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 12.35hrs. which is fifteen minutes ahead of his service. The common portion is from Rourkela to Gurundia which is almost 70kms. Hence he has suggested that the timing given by the applicant at Rourkela point may be modified and minimum gap of 30 minutes is maintained between the two services. He proposed that applicant may be given to depart at 12.20hrs. instead of 12.35hrs. from Rourkela and at 15.20hrs. from Gurundia.
3. Husan Ara, owner of vehicle No.OR14U-3407 is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that there is clash of time at Rourkela. His departure time from Rourkela is 6.00hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart at 5.45. But it is seen from the permit that the objector's departure time from Rourkela is 7.10. The objector stated that there is clash of time at Birda which is exact time proposed by the applicant. The objector further stated that at Gurundia, his vehicle is departing at 15.50 whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 15.25 from Gurundia. Since the applicant proposed to depart 25 minutes prior to the service of the objector from Gurundia but it will reach Rourkela just 8 minutes prior to his vehicle. This may be verified. It may also be verified whether the route applied by the applicant is under intra region or inter region.

Whether the route is under RTA, Rourkela or Inter Region route, should be verified before grant of T.P.

223.ROUTE-BARBIL TO BHADRAK VIA KEONJHAR , DHENKIKOTE AND BACK, FIROJ KUMAR SAHOO, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO.OR09P-5501.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri K.C.Das.

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Sri A.C.Barik, owner of vehicle No.OR09R-3619 stated that his service is departing Keonjhar at 8.50hrs.whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 8.45hrs. just five minutes ahead of his service. In this regard, applicant stated that he has proposed to ply his service as express service whereas the objector is plying his service as ordinary service.

2. Masud Alam, owner of two vehicles i.e. No.OD09.0041 and OD09H-0941 has stated that his first service is plying on the route Keonjhar to Barbil under the RTA permit. His departure time from Joda is at 6.30 whereas the applicant has applied at 6.24hrs. which is six minutes ahead of his service. But the time gap at Remuli is reduced. Hence, the objector suggested that the applicant may be given time after his service.

Another vehicle of above objector i.e. OD09H-0941 is plying on the route Barbil to J.K.Road. He stated that the departure time of his vehicle at Keonjhar is at 8.55hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

224.ROUTE- KHUNTA TO BALASORE VIA GOHIRA , NILAGIRI AND BACK, GOPABANDHU MOHAPATRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO.OD05C-7326.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri K.C.Das. Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Sri K.K.Dash, owner of vehicle No.OR01Q-1404 is represented by Advocate Sri J.N.Mohanty. He stated that he has obtained PP from RTA which may be verified. The same has been updated in OPMS. He stated that his service is operating from Balasore to Udala (2RT). His departure time from Balasore is 10.40hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 10.20hrs. which is twenty minutes ahead of his service. Applicant may be given time after his service. He further stated that there is no service between 10.40 to 12.15hrs.
2. Sri K.C.Pradhan, owner of vehicle No.OR01L-1121 is represented by Advocate Sri J.N.Mohanty. He stated that he is operating his service under the permit issued by RTA. His departure time from Balasore is at 16.25hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart at 16.00hrs. which is twenty five minutes ahead of his service. There is clash of time from Balasore to Gohira which is 40 kms. The objector suggested that the applicant may be given time after his service.
3. Sri Narendra Bihari Das, is represented by Advocate Sri D.B.Das and Associates stated that at Udala his service is departing at 6.30hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 7.20hrs. He suggested that the applicant may be given another ten minutes gap at Udala point.

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

225. ROUTE- M RAMPUR TO BHANJANAGAR VIA BALIGUDA , K.NUAGAM AND

BACK, TUNA SAHU, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO.OD12C-6699.

Applicant is present.

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Sri Manas Ranjan Pradhan, owner of two vehicles i.e. OR02BK-4120 and OR25A-8675 is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the departure time at Baliguda in respect of his vehicle OR02BK-4120 is 17.15hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 17.17hrs. just two minutes after his service. He stated that adequate gap may be maintained.
2. Another vehicle of objector i.e. OR25A-8675 is plying Guma to Phulbani. His departure time at Tumudibandh in respect of timing of above vehicle is at 7.15hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 7.07hrs. which is just eight minutes ahead of his service. He stated that adequate gap may be maintained in ahead of his service.

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

226. ROUTE-KANTABANJI TO GOLAMUNDA VIA SINDHEKELA , CHANDUTARA AND BACK, BADRI NARAYAN MISHRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OR15R-6369.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri R.N.Singh.

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

227. ROUTE-BHETBAR TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA HAJA , JANKIA AND BACK, MANASI MANJARI MOHAPATRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD02AF-6664.

Applicant is represented by her husband Sri S.P.Mohapatra. There is an objection filed by Sri Tushar Kanta Acharya, owner of vehicle No.OR02BK-0972. He stated that his service is departing Bhubaneswar at 13.20hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 13.20hrs. which is exact time of this objector. Hence he suggested that applicant may be given departure time from Bhubaneswar at 14.00hrs. Both applicant and objector agreed to it.

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

228. ROUTE-ROURKELA TO GOBINDPUR VIA DHENKANAL , MANGULI AND

BACK, NIROD KUMAR DASH, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD14U-3139.

Applicant is present and stated that he has applied to ply his service as night service.

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

229. **ROUTE-GAILO TO KUSUMI VIA VEDVYAS , TUMRAN AND BACK,**
SAIRINDHRI PATEL, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO.OD14U-3871.

Applicant is represented by her son Sri R.R.Patel.

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

230. **ROUTE- NUAPADA TO SINAPALI VIA MICHAPALI , KOMNA AND BACK,**
BHUPENDRA PRASAD JAGAT, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO.OD17G-4333.

Applicant is present.

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

231. **ROUTE-BENIAPALI TO BARGARH VIA BHUKTA , AMBABHONA AND BACK,**
BIJAY KUMAR MAHAPATRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO.OD13F-6761.

Applicant is present.

Since the route applied by the applicant is an enclave route i.e. some portion comes under Chhatisgarh State, it should not be considered. There is no agreement between Odisha and Chhatisgarh Government. Besides, applicant should apply off line instead of OPMS.

This is not to be considered.

232. **ROUTE-BHUBANESWAR TO KANTAMAL VIA DASAPALLA, BOUDH AND**
BACK, SALMA SULTANA, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO.OR02BC-1432.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. He stated that he has applied to ply his service as alter service of OR02BN-5299.

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Sri A.K.Routray, owner of vehicle No.OR11G-3535 is represented by Advocate Sri S.Misra. He stated that the vehicle of the applicant is a sleeper coach and applied to operate in day service which should not be considered. Besides, there is clash of time from Bhubaneswar to Dasapalla and the applicant has proposed to depart Bhubaneswar 35 minutes ahead of his service.

2. Manjulata Prusty, owner of vehicle No.OD25-8299 is represented by Advocate Sri A.K.Nayak. He stated that the applicant's vehicle is a sleeper coach and he has applied to ply in day service. Hence, the case of applicant should not be considered.
3. Sri K.C.Sahoo, owner of two vehicles i.e. No.OR02AK-5511 and No.OR05Z-3349 stated that applicant's vehicle is a sleeper coach and he has applied to ply in day service. Hence, the case of applicant should not be considered.
4. Sonali Jena, owner of vehicle No.OD02AH-8004 is represented by her husband Sri Sunil Kumar Jena. He stated that applicant's vehicle is a sleeper coach and he has applied to ply in day service. Hence, the case of applicant should not be considered. This may be verified.

233.ROUTE-BAHADAJHOLA TO BUGUDA VIA JAGANNATHPRASAD AND BACK, G JAGADISH ACHARY, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO.OR07N-9886.

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

There are two objections have been filed by Sri Suryanarayan Panigrahi, owner of vehicle No.OR07AA-5099 and OR07T-8207 and Sri R.K.Padhy, owner of vehicle No.OD32B-5152.

Since the vehicle of the applicant is a 18 seater vehicle, this case is not to be considered. Hence, it is rejected.

234.ROUTE-CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) TO LAXMIPUR VIA BALIGUDA , TUMUDIBANDHA AND BACK, SAGAR KUMAR, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO.OD02L-5225.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that he has applied alter service of Sl.No.28. The objection given in sl.No.28 may be taken into consideration.

This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time as well as objection raised in sl.No.28.

235. ROUTE-KEONJHAR TO BARIPADA VIA JASHIPUR , BISOI AND BACK, PRADOSH KUMAR GIRI, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO OD11U-1917.

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

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

236. ROUTE-PURI MUNICIPALTY BUS STAND TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA KALPANA , RASULGARH AND BACK, SRI PRASAD SINHA, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD13N-2799.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri P.K.Behera. He stated that he has applied in vacant slot i.e. slot No.72 and 260 from Puri and slot No.136 and 268 from Bhubaneswar. The applicants of sl.No.341 and 342 have applied in same slot which may be heard jointly.

There is an objection filed by Manjulata Rout, owner of vehicle No.OD05AV-5377 is represented by Advocate Sri S.Mishra. He stated that this objector has applied in same slot vide sl.No.347.

This may be considered subject to hearing the same combinedly with applicants of Sl.No.236,341,342 and 347.

237. ROUTE-KORAPUT TO NABARANGPUR AND BACK, B SUBRAMANYUM PATRO, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO.OD10P-4527.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri P.K.Behera.

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

238. ROUTE- MALISAH I TO BALUGAON VIA DARPANARAYANPUR , RANAPUR AND BACK, KAILASH BEHER, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OR25-8515.

Applicant is present.

There is no objection. The vehicle may be allowed to start from Nayagarh Bus Stand instead of Malisahi which is not at all a bus stoppage and situated in Nayagarh town.

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

239. ROUTE- KELO TO JHARSUGUDA VIA NIKTIMAL , KULEIMURA AND BACK, RAKESH KUMAR SAHU, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO OD16-6555.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri Satrughna Das.

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

240. ROUTE- CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) TO GUNUPUR VIA TAPTAPANI , LUHAGUDI AND BACK, SAGAR KUMAR, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO.OD33B-5225.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that this is alter service of Sl.No.241.

There is an objection filed by Satyanarayan Panda, owner of vehicle No.OD02AZ-1599 and Anasuya Panda, owner of vehicle No.OD02AZ-1199 are presented by Advocate Sri M.B.K.Rao. He stated

that the objectors are operating their vehicles from Bhubaneswar to Gunupur via Berhampur and Parlakhmundi as alter services to each other. The departure time from Bhubaneswar in respect of the vehicle of 1st objector is 22.15 whereas the applicant has suggested at 22.10 just ten minutes ahead of his service. In up trip, the departure of his service from Gunupur is 20.45 whereas the applicant has proposed to leave at 20.40 just five minutes ahead of his service. Hence he has suggested that the applicant may be given time to depart Bhubaneswar at 22.30hrs. in the up trip and from Gunupur in the return trip after fifteen minutes of his service i.e. maintaining a gap of fifteen minutes.

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

241. ROUTE- CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) TO GUNUPUR VIA TAPTAPANI , LUHAGUDI AND BACK, SRIMATI KAMALA DEVI, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO.OD33G-5225.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that this is alter service of Sl.No.242.

This may be disposed of according to the observations made in sl.No.240.

242. ROUTE- MEGHAJHOLI TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA ASKA , KABISURYANAGAR AND BACK, SUSIL KUMAR PANIGRAHI, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO.OD07AE-3211.

Applicant is present. Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Sri R.N.Behera, owner of vehicle No.OD02BA-5810 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that there is clash of time at Aska. His departure time at Aska is 10.35 hrs whereas the applicant has applied 10.27hrs. just eight minutes ahead of his service. Aska to Bhubaneswar i.e. 67kms. is common corridor. Applicant may be given time after his service. He also stated that there is gap from 11.45 to 12.30 which may be verified.
2. Laxmi Priya Mohanty, owner of vehicle No.OD02BB-8233 and OR23E-3093 is represented by Sri K.C.Sahu. He stated that at Aska, her service is departing at 10.45hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart at 10.27 hrs. which is eighteen minutes ahead of her service.

As regards the timing of her another vehicle No.OR23E-3093, he has stated that her service is departing Aska at 11.00hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart at 10.27hrs. Applicant may be given timing after her service.

3. Sri Satyanarayan Panda, owner of vehicle No.OD02AD-8299 stated that the departure of his above vehicle at Aska is 11.15hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Aska at 10.27hrs. Hence, he proposed that the applicant may be given time after his service.

243. ROUTE- BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO BALIPADAR VIA KHALIKOTE CHHAKA , BUDHAMBHA AND BACK, LAXMIPRIYA MOHANTY, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD02J-6733.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that, while he had applied TP in OPMS, it was inadvertently mentioned Bhubaneswar Departure time of 5.00 hrs. has been accepted by the system as clash free although there is another vehicle OD02BB-8233 belong to the applicant with Bhubaneswar departure time of 5.00 hrs and thus there is direct clash of time at Bhubaneswar. Further he stated that the alignment of the applied vehicle be made via Golia and Sadaka in between Mandara and Polasara which have been omitted by the system at the time of making application. Hence, he requested that TP may be issued in respect of the applied vehicle to ply in applied route Bhubaneswar to Balipadar via Golia and Sadak and back with Bhubaneswar departure 4.55hrs.

There is an objection filed by Sri R.K.Behera, owner of vehicle No.OD02N-8402 through Advocdate Sri S.Mishra. He stated that at Bhubaneswar, his departure time is at 5.10hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart at 5.00hrs. which is ten minutes ahead of his service. This objection is not a valid objection. He further stated that, in return trip, the timing applied by the applicant may be revised at 10.10 instead of 10.20hrs.

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

244. ROUTE-PADAMPUR TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA NARENDRAPUR , PITIKIRA AND BACK., ANANT KISHORE SAHOO, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO.OD29E-1914.

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

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Sri B.K.Rout, owner of vehicle No.OD05E-8827 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that the vehicle No.OD05AD-3406 was granted PP from Palisahi to Cuttack, Cuttack to Asureswar and back which is now vacant and not notified. As per decision taken in the 287 STA meeting held on 22.1.2019 without any notification, the present applicant has applied TP which may be verified. Besides, at Korua, the objector's vehicle is departing at 6.30hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 6.32hrs.

- which is two minutes after his service. Similarly from Asureswar, the departure time gap applied by the applicant comes to six minutes after his service. Though the applicant proposed to leave Korua and Asureswar point after his service, but it reaches Salipur before four minutes of the service of this objector which may be verified. Hence he requested that the applicant may be allowed timing after his service.
2. Sri B.K.Nayak, owner of vehicle No.OR05AP-3644 is represented by Advocate Sri J.N.Mohanty. He stated that his route merges at Asureswar vide his slot No.63 in respect of his above vehicle i.e. OR05AP-3644. The applicant has applied in same portion which is now operating by this objector which merges in the rationalized route at Asureswar also having no slot. The applicant has applied in slot No.50 from Salipur to Cuttack which was earlier allotted to vehicle No.OD05AD-3406. Besides, this objector has stated that his service is starting from Ramachandrapur whereas the applicant has proposed to start from Padmapur which is a co-village through which the service of this objector is passing. Besides, there is clashing of time at Manikpur, Korua, Karat, Asureswar and Salipur.
 3. Sri Biswaranjan Jethy, owner of vehicle No.OD05B-4415 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that the vehicle No.OD05AD-3406 was granted PP from Palisahi to Cuttack, Cuttack to Asureswar and back which is now vacant and not notified. This should be notified as per policy decision of the STA. Besides, there is clash of time at Manikpur. His service is departing Manikpur at 6.05hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 5.55hrs. just ten minutes ahead of his service. Applicant has not mentioned the important stoppages like Patakura and Garadpur.
 4. Sri B.N.Bhuyan, owner of vehicle No.OR05U-0147 is represented by Advocate Sri S.Mishra. He stated that the applicant has applied in slots which were vacated by three previous PP holders i.e. OR05AD-3406, OR05Q-7905 and OR05H-9910 in the rationalized timings. Besides, the objector has stated that the applicant was illegally plying his service without permit and VCR has been drawn against the applicant's applied vehicle. This may be verified.
 5. Sri S.K.Routray, owner of vehicle No.OR05Q-7905 stated that he was operating his above service on the route Mahanga to Cuttack, Cuttack to K.Kula via Salipur and back, Cuttack to Erkana and back on the PP issued by RTA, Cuttack. The said permit was valid upto 5.11.18. Due to want of repair of said bus, the same was declared off-road and also due to financial condition he was unable to get the vehicle repaired for which he could not renew his PP after 5.11.18.

Hence, now the present applicant has applied the TP on the timings applied to his above vehicle.

When, the objector has not renewed his permit in time though two years is going to be passed, he has no claim for retention of his timing. Hence, his objection has no merit and should not be considered.

6. Sri N.Senapati, owner of vehicle No.OR05AF-7288 is represented by Advocate Sri P.K.Behera. He stated that there is clash of time from Nuapada to Cuttack which is gap of 6 minutes after his service from Nuapada and will cover 33 kms up to Cuttack. The applicant has applied from Padmapur which is touching rationalized route at Asureswar which is 15kms. ahead from Salipur. Besides, the objector stated that the applicant has applied the slot No.50, DN, Cat-A left by vehicle No.OR05AD-3406 which was plying Pali Sahi to Cuttack and Cuttack to Gadagadiaghat.

But applicant stated that he has applied in Vacant slots i.e. 50A and 64A from Cuttack and slot No.165A from Asureswar and vacant slot No.192A from Cuttack.

6. Tanuja Bhuyan, owner of vehicle No.OR05J-2757 is represented by Advocate Sri S. Mishra. He stated that this objector is plying her above service on the route Kurua to Cuttack and Back (2RT) which is coming under Cuttack to Pattamundai Rationalised route. But the timing applied by applicant in last down trip from Cuttack is just ten minutes after her service which will clash from Cuttack to Korua which is 61 kms.

It is decided that since the vacant slot has been shown in our website, the same may be treated as notified. No further notification of route is required. Hence, this may be considered subject to verification of clash free time as well as vacant slot.

245. ROUTE- SADHUMUNDA TO ROURKELA VIA GUMARDIHI , RANIBANDH AND BACK, MOHAMMAD SALAUDDIN ANSARI, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD16A-5155.

Applicant is represented his son Md. R.Ansari.

There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time as well as vacant slots in rationalized route.

246.ROUTE- TANGI TO PURI VIA KADUAGHAT , GADASAHIJANKIA AND BACK, PURNA CHANDRA MOHANTY, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO.OD13M-8577.

Applicant is present. He stated that Mangaljodi and Sahaspur stoppage may be added, Mangaljodi stoppage is between Tangi and Bhusundpur and Sahaspur stoppage is between Adal and Kaduaghat.

There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time. It may also be considered to add stoppages like Mangalajodi and Sahaspur between Tangi –Bhusandpur and Adal – Kaduaghat respectively.

247. ROUTE- UDAYAPUR TO BERHAMPUR VIA LUHAGUDI , TAPTAPANI AND BACK, JITENDRA KUMAR SAHU, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD07K-9181.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.KRao.

There is an objection filed by Sri Niranjan Nayak, owner of vehicle No.OR07R-0483, OR07Z-2483. He stated that his above two services are operating on the route Berhampur to Keradanga and Rayagada, Gajapati. The timing applied by the applicant is hampering his business.

Besides, he also stated that he has applied TP in respect of his another vehicle No. OD07AD-5123 on the route Koinpur to Berhampur via Jirang, Mandalsahi, Ramgiri, Chheligarh, Chandiput and Luhagadi. His proposed dep. time at Berhampur is 15.45hrs.(which has not yet been considered) whereas the applicant has applied to depart at 15.42hrs. which is just three minutes ahead of his service. Similarly, the proposed departure timing given by this objector at R.Udayagiri is 8.50hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 8.25hrs.

This may be verified and considered subject to revision of timing to make it clash free time.

248. ROUTE- ASHOKJHAR TO CHAMPUA VIA DEOBANDHA , PANDAPADA AND BACK, ARBINASH SAHOO, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD09Q-9851.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri S.Mishra. Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Sri K.Mahanta, owner of vehicle No.OD09H-1784 is represented by Sri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that at Champua, his service is departing at 12.10hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 12.09hrs just one minute ahead of his service. Hence he requested that, applicant may be given time after his service.
2. Sri R.R.Bhanj Deo, owner of vehicle No.OR09N-5629 stated that his service is departing from Keonjhar at 10.20hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart at 10.10hrs. just ten minutes ahead of his service. Applicant may be given time after his service.
3. Sri M.K.Mishra, owner of vehicle No.OD04A-9184 is represented by Advocate K. Mohammad. He stated that his service is departing Keonjhar at 10.25hrs. whereas the applicant has

applied to depart at 10.10hrs. which is fifteen minutes ahead of his service. Since the applicant has proposed to depart fifteen minutes ahead of his service at Keonjhar, but five minutes after his service at Jhumora which is irrational. Hence, he stated that the timing may be proportionate and applicant may be given later timings.

4. Masud Allam, owner of vehicle No.OR09L-3041 stated that at Keonjhar, his service is departing at 10.35hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart at 10.10hrs. which is twenty five minutes ahead of his service. The applicant may be given after his service.
5. Sri S.Mohanty, owner of vehicle No.OD11J-1790 is represented by Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. He stated that his service is departing Duburi at 6.20hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 6.00hrs. just twenty minutes ahead of his service. Hence, he requested that the timing of applicant at Duburi point may be revised.
6. Nilimarani Pati, owner of vehicle No.OD09D-3737 is represented by Advocate Sri P.K.Behera. He stated that at Keonjhar, her departure time is 10.10hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 10.10hrs. which is same time of this objector. Hence he requested that applicant may be given after the service of this objector.
7. Sri Firoj Kumar Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OR09N-4401 is represented by Advocate Sri K.C.Das. He stated that at Brahmanipal, his service is departing at 7.05hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 6.46hrs. which is just nine minutes ahead of his service. Hence, he has requested that the applicant may be given after his service.
8. Sri K.C.Mishra, owner of vehicle No.OD09F-3737 is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the service of this objector is departing Champua at 12.18hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 12.09hrs. which is just nine minutes ahead of his service. Hence he requested that the proposed departure given by the applicant at Champua may be revised and applicant may be given time after his service from Champua. He further stated that, if the applicant shall be allowed to depart Keonjhar at 9.15hrs.All objections made above may be solved.

It is decided that, the applicant shall submit a revised clash free time for consideration of his application. This may be considered on receipt of revised clash free time by the applicant.

249. ROUTE-KOTAGARH TO BHUBANESWAR VIA BAGHAMARI, KHURDA AND BACK, SUSRIKANTA DAS, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD05U-6582.

Applicant is present.

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

250. ROUTE- NABARANGPUR TO JUNAGARH VIA JAIPATANA , MUKHIGUDA AND BACK, DIBYARANJAN SAHU, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD08M-9222.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri S.Mishra. He stated that, he has submitted a revised timing which may be considered.

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

251. ROUTE- NABARANGPUR TO JUNAGARH VIA JAIPATANA , MUKHIGUDA AND BACK, DIBYARANJAN SAHU, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO OD08M-9222.

Applicant is present.

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

252. ROUTE- KADUAPADA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA BEGUNIA , KHURDA NEW BUSTAND AND BACK, RAMAKRUSHNA DAS, OR13E-1244.

Applicant is present.

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

253. ROUTE- DEOGARH TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA PARJANG , KAMAKHYANAGAR AND BACK, GAYADHAR SWAIN, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO.OR05AG-3199.

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

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Sri L.D.Mohapatra, owner of vehicle No.OD05AN-5475 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that he is operating his service on the route Kalamati to Bhubaneswar via Barkote, Dhenkanal, Dhabaleswar and Cuttack. But the applicant has applied to obtain TP on the route Deogarh to Bhubaneswar via Parjang, Kamakhyanagar and back. The Deogarh is situated beyond 12 kms. from Kalamati. The common corridor is Kalamati to Bhubaneswar. The departure time of this objector at Dhenkanal is at 9.19hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 9.19hrs. which is exact time. At Dhabaleswar, the dep. time of the objector is 10.15hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 10.15 which is

also same time. At Barakote point, this objector is departing his service at 5.07hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 4.48hrs. just 19 minutes ahead of his service. Hence, he stated that adequate time gap may be maintained from starting point i.e. from Barakote.

2. Sri B.K.Rout, owner of vehicle No.OD05AQ-7288 stated that at Cuttack, his service is departing at 13.10hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart at 13.05hrs. which is just five minutes ahead of his service.

Applicant stated that he has applied in different alignment of route and will not touch Dhenkanal Bus Stand. His service will proceed through bye-Pass.

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

254. ROUTE-BARAGAN TO TARABHA VIA LACHHIPUR , MENDA AND BACK, SUBRAT KUMAR DASH, OD17T-1919.

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

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

255. ROUTE- TAINSAR TO SAMBALPUR VIA TIKILIPADA , JAMANKIRA AND BACK, SUBASH KUMAR PRUSTI, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD28B-5494.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. He stated that the stoppage should be corrected as Tainsiria instead of Tainsar. Sl.No.1 shall be corrected as Tainsiria. But serial No.5 shall remain unchanged and it will be the Tainsar.

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

256. ROUTE- BANKI TO BHUBANESWAR VIA BAGHAMARI, KHURDA AND BACK, PRAMOD KUMAR SINGHASAMANTA, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD02AV-1826.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri A.K.Behera.
Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Sri Amulya Behera, owner of vehicle No.OR02BA-5380, OR05AC-5236 and OD02AU-4931 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that this objector is operating his above three vehicles on the route Bheda to Master Canteen via Banki, Banki to Master Canteen and Talabasta to Master Canteen via Banki.



He stated that the departure time of his vehicle No.OD02BA-5380 at Banki is 6.40hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 6.25hrs. which is fifteen minutes ahead of his service and reaching Bhubaneswar one minute earlier.

Similarly, his another vehicle No. OR05AC-5236 is departing Banki at 11.45hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 11.30hrs. which is fifteen minutes ahead of his service and reaching Bhubaneswar earlier.

His another vehicle No.OD02AU-4931 is departing Bhubaneswar at 16.58hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 16.54hrs. which is just four minutes ahead of his service and reaching Banki thirteen minutes earlier. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be given time after timing of his above vehicles.

Applicant stated that the vehicle No.OR02BA-5380 of this objector does not have Insurance Certificate and Fitness Certificate which may be verified.

This may be verified whether the vehicle No.OR02BA-5380 of the above objector has Insurance and Fitness certificate.

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

257.ROUTE- BUDAGUDA TO BERHAMPUR VIA ASURBANDHA , GOBINDAPUR AND BACK, E LOKANATH, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD07D-2077.

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

One objection is filed by Sri Niranjana Das, owner of vehicle No.OR12B-5027 represented by Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. He stated that the common corridor is from Daringbadi to Govindpur which is 40 kms. distance and also ghat road. His service is departing Daringbadi at 5.15hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart at 5.50hrs. which is 35 minutes after his service. He stated that adequate time gap may be maintained since the route is ghat road.

Advocate appearing for the applicant requested that, applicant wants to modify his Departure time at Berhampur as 17.32 hrs. instead of 17.34hrs. which may be verified.

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

258. ROUTE-BAGHIAPADA TO SONEPUR VIA JANAPANK , BAUNSUNI AND BACK, RAJ KISHOR RAJ, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD15A-6116.

Applicant is absent.

There is no objection. T.P. may be granted subject to clash free timings.

259. ROUTE-NABARANGAPUR TO MALKANGIRI AND BACK, B SUBRAMANYAM PATRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO.OR02BZ-3885.

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

260. ROUTE-SAMBALPUR TO SUNDARGARH VIA RENGALI , JHARSUGUDA AND BACK, ARADHANA SINGH, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD23E-4777.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that he has applied in vacant slot no.23 from Sambalpur and slot no.27 from Jharsuguda, slot No.105 from Sundargarh, slot no.101 from Jharsuguda, slot No.141 from Sundargarh. The above slots are vacant.

There is one objection filed by Sri P.K.Debata, owner of vehicle No.OD15L-3474. He stated that he is operating his service on the route from Bardol to Rourkela and back. The departure time of his service from Rourkela is at 12.35PM from Rourkela and 3.10PM from Sundargarh towards Sambalpur. But the applicant of SI.No.260 and SI.No.270 have applied the 3.10PM time slot from Sundargarh in which timing of his service is clashing.

This may be verified and considered subject to verification of clash free time and whether the applicant has applied in vacant slot.

261. ROUTE-KANDEKELA TO SUNDARGARH VIA GARJANBAHAL , TUMLIA AND BACK, SUBHASHISH MISHRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD23E-1563.

Applicant is present.

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

262. ROUTE-RENGALI TO JHARSUGUDA VIA BANDHABAHAL , GUMADERA AND BACK, HEMANTA NAIK, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OR23E-3681.

Applicant is absent. No objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

263. ROUTE-BADARAMA TO ROURKELA VIA LAIKERA , JHARIBAHAL AND BACK, SAMARENDRA LAHA, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO OD15B-7080.

Applicant is represented by Advocate K.Mohammad. He requested that the stoppage at Kutra may be deleted as it is coming under rationalized route. He further stated that he has not applied in any rationalized route.

There is one objection filed by Md. Gayasuddin, owner of vehicle No.OR16C-5859. He stated that there is clash of time at Rourkela. The

applicant has proposed departure time in up trip from Rourkela is just four minutes after his service. and ply on same rationalised route. Since, the applicant proposed to depart Rourkela after his service, but will overtake his service at Bamara to Kutra. In return trip, there is also clash of time at Bamara. His departure time from Bamara is 7.30AM whereas the applicant has applied to leave at 7.26hrs.

Applicant stated that he has applied in different alignment and stated that common corridor is Rourkela to Ranibandha which is 35kms.

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

264. ROUTE-BANEI TO SUNDARGARH VIA MAHULPALLI , KABRIBAHAL AND BACK, SABITA PUROHIT, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD16G-2155.

Applicant is represented by her son Sri N.R.Purohit.

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

265. ROUTE-ROURKELA TO IB THERMAL VIA SARGIPALI , RAIBAGA AND BACK, RATAN KUMAR SARANGEE, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OR16B-8183.

Applicant is present. Since the vehicle of the applicant is more than fifteen years, this should not be considered for inter region routes.

266. ROUTE-KANTABANJI TO KHARIAR VIA BANGOMUNDA , ARADA AND BACK, SANPREET SINGH, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD26D-5777.

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

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

267. ROUTE-LAIDA TO ROURKELAVIA MAJHAPADA , KIRAI AND BACK, MD GYASUDDIN, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO.OR16D-7557.

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Shamim Akhtar, owner of vehicle No.OR16C-8774 is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the route applied by the applicant is covering rationalised route. The objector is operating his route Rajagangpur to Rorkela in slot no.33 which departs Rourkela at 11.30hrs. in slot no.73. The applicant has applied in same slot i.e. sl. No.73 from Sundargarh. He stated that the portion of the objector's route from Tudalaga to Rourkela which is about 86 kms. covers the rationalised portion i.e. Sundargarh to Rourkela. Hence he requested

that the application of the applicant should not be considered as he has not applied in any vacant slot. He further stated that the objector has replaced his above vehicle in place of his vehicle No.OR16C-9377. This may be verified.

2. Sri P.K.Patel, owner of vehicle No.OD16C-0507 is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the route applied by the applicant is covering rationalised route.

3. Sabita Purohit, owner of vehicle No.OR16D-3755 is represented her son Sri K.Purohit. He stated that there is clash of time in return trip from Sundargarh to Jharialbahal, Sahaspur which is 60kms. and applicant has proposed his timing ahead of this objector. The departure time from Sundargarh in respect of the timing of the service of this objector is 14.35hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart at 14.09hrs. which is 26 kms. ahead of her service. He also stated that the applicant has mentioned the name of an unknown stoppage namely Govindpur which is only one kilometre distance from important stoppage i.e. Bamra. The commoncorridor is till Bamara which is 40 kms. This may be changed as Bamra instead of Govindpur. Govindpur point may be deleted from OPMS. Hence he has requested that the applicant may be given after his service.

Applicant stated that he has applied to ply his service as express service, whereas the objectors' service is ordinary service. Hence, the objection raised by this objector should not be entertained.

This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time as well as whether the route applied by the applicant is coming under rationalized route or not and whether applicant has applied in vacant slot in rationalization portion of the route.

268. ROUTE-SAMBALPUR TO ROURKELA VIA KIRAI , SUNDARGARH AND BACK, JITENDRA TANDIA, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD23J-9164.

Applicant is present.

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Md.Sabdar Alli, owner of vehicle No.OD16A-9255 is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the applicant has applied in rationalized route from Sambalpur to Rourkela which directly covers two rationalized routes i.e. Sambalpur to Sundargarh and Sundargarh to Rourkela. The timings applied by the applicant are not vacant on the rationalized chart and clashing with the timings of the service of this objector from Sundargarh to Rourkela.
2. Sri D.K.Sarangı, owner of vehicle No.OR16E-3663 is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the applicant has applied in rationalized route from Sambalpur to Rourkela which directly

cover two rationalized routes i.e. Sambalpur to Sundargarh and Sundargarh to Rourkela. The timings applied by the applicant are not vacant on the rationalized chart and clashing with the timings of the service of this objector from Rourkela to Sundargarh.

This may be verified whether the applicant has applied in any vacant slot of the rationalized route or not.

269. ROUTE-JHARSUGUDA TO SAMBALPUR VIA RENGALI , KILOSAMA AND BACK, MONALISHA RATHA, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD23-9643.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. He stated that he has applied in same slot against which OR023B-7777 was plying and the said vehicle belongs to same owner.

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

270. ROUTE-SUNDARGARH TO SAMBALPUR VIA JHARSUGUDA , RENGALI AND BACK, N SANTOSH KUMAR, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD23E-0097.

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

There is an objection filed by Sri P.K.Debata, owner of vehicle No.OD15L-3474. He stated that he has already given an objection in sl.No.260. The same may be taken into consideration in present case of the applicant of sl.No.270.

Applicant stated that he has applied in vacant slot No.13 and 139 from Sundargarh and slot No.184 and 185 from Sambalpur.

This may be verified whether applicant has applied in vacant slots. If so, it should be considered, otherwise, the application of the applicant should not be considered.

271. ROUTE-SAMBALPUR TO BOLANGIR VIA DUNGURIPALI , CHERUPALLI AND BACK, SUKANTA MISHRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD17U-2726.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri Priya Ranjan Swain.

There is an objection filed by Sri R.K.Kar, owner of vehicle No.OR15P-1755 through Advocate Sri J.N.Mohanty. He stated that the route applied by the Applicant is coming under the rationalized route from Sambalpur to Baragarh. He further stated that there is clash of time from Sambalpur to Bolangir. His service is departing Sambalpur at 5.25hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart from Sambalpur at 5.00hrs. which is not in rationalization time chart. The service of this objector is departing Bargarh at 7.20hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 7.18hrs. which is just two minutes ahead of his service. Hence this objector has stated that in the whole route, the timing proposed by the applicant is clashing with the timing of his service.

It may be examined whether the applicant has applied in rationalized route and timing or not. In case it is the slot time, time gap may be proportionately maintained.

This is required to be heard together in sl.No.271 and 272 as both the applicants have applied in same route.

272. ROUTE-SAMBALPUR TO BOLANGIR VIA DUNGURIPALI , CHERUPALLI AND BACK, SUBRAT KUMAR MISHRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO OR03J-2828.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri Priya Ranjan Swain.

There is an objection filed by Sri R.K.Kar, owner of vehicle No.OR15P-1755 through Advocate Sri J.N.Mohanty. He stated that the route applied by the applicant is coming under the rationalised route from Sambalpur to Bargarh.

The observations given in sl.No.271 may be adopted.

This is required to be heard together (sl.No.272 and 271) as both the applicants have applied in same route and considered on merit.

273. ROUTE-SUNDARGARH TO ROURKELA VIA RAJGANGPUR AND BACK, RAJESH KUMAR PRADHAN, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO.OD14T-7179.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that he has applied the timing of his another vehicle No.OD16A-1695 which PP is valid till 19.1.2022. It may be verified whether the PP issued in respect of vehicle No.OD16A-1695 is valid or not.

This is required to be heard with sl.No.277.

274. ROUTE-GAISELET TO NAUGAON VIA ANGUL , DHENKANAL AND BACK, SAGAR KUMAR, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO.OD02T-5225.

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

There is no objection. It may be considered subject to verification of clash free time and also whether the route applied by the applicant is covering in any rationalized route from Cuttack to Jagatsinghpur or any other rationalized route.

275. ROUTE-BUNDIA TO SAMBALPUR VIA THELKOLOI , KHINDA AND BACK, RAJESH KUMAR SINGH, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO.OD23H-8769.

Applicant is present.

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

276. **ROUTE-RENGALI TO JHARSUGUDA VIA BANDHABAHAL , GUMADERA AND BACK, SABITA NAIK, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD23J-9411.**

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

277. **ROUTE-SUNDARGARH TO ROURKELA AND BACK, PRADEEP KUMAR DEBATA, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO.OD15M-3474.**

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

This is required for common hearing with sl.No.273 and considered on merit.

278. **ROUTE-NARSINGH PUR TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA ATHAGARH , CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) AND BACK, AMIT RANJAN MISHRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD09B-8726.**

Applicant is present. He stated that he has applied in vacant slots.

There is an objection filed by Sri Pratap Kumar Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OR05AG-6355 through Advocate Sri S.Mishra. He stated that he has replaced the vehicle No.OR05AG-6355 in place of his vehicle No.OD05AU-6155. He stated that the applicant has not applied in any vacant rationalised slots. The proposed timing applied by the applicant in the down trip from Narasinghpur is at slot No.21 and in up trip the applicant has probably applied in slot No.67 from Cuttack side. These slots are being allotted in favour of another vehicle No.OR05T-6145 which may be verified.

This may be verified whether the applicant has applied in any vacant slots or not. If he has applied in any vacant slots, this may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

279. **ROUTE-BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO KAMALADIHA VIA BADAMBA NARSINGH PUR AND BACK, MOHARANA SANTOSH KUMAR, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO.OD33V-0367.**

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri P.K.Behera. He stated that the applied route of applicant is vacant route on account of surrender of PP granted in respect of vehicle No.OR05AC-4349. The said vehicle has been allotted slot No.10 in the up trip and slot No.102 in the down trip. As per final rationalisation of timings dtd. 31.1.2020, slot No.10 in the up trip and slot No.102 in the down trip is remaining vacant.

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Sri H.K.Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OR05AG-5909 is represented by Advocate Sri P.K.Behera. He stated that in up trip from Cuttack to

Narasinghpur, at Badamba, his service is departing at 7.49hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave at 7.55hrs. in rationalized route. Applicant has not applied in vacant slot in rationalized route.

2. Sri S.K.Sethy, owner of vehicle No.OR02BU-1977 is represented by Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. He stated that in the down trip at Athagarh, his service is departing at 14.25hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 14.29hrs. which is just four minutes after his service which will directly clash with timings of his vehicle.
3. Sri J.K.Dash, owner of vehicle No.OR05AC-6355 (replaced vehicle No.OD05AW-7209) is represented by Advocate Sri S.Mishra. He stated that he has applied in same slot vide serial No.182 which has been heard on 7.3.2020 and as there is no objectors, his case has been considered.

This will be heard jointly with sl.No.182 and considered on merit.

**280. ROUTE-KAMALADIHA TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA BADAMBA ,
ATHAGARH AND BACK, ASHOK KUMAR SAMANTRAY, OWNER OF
VEHICLE NO.OR05AG-5955.**

Applicant is present.

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Sri S.K.Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OR05P-5148 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that he was issued PP which was valid till 11.11.18. Since, the renewal of PP application was ✓ rejected by the Secretary, STA, the objector had challenged the same before the Hon'ble STAT. Hon'ble STAT has been pleased to set aside the order dt.21.1.2020 passed by the Secretary, STA by allowing the appeal and further directed the Secretary, STA to consider the renewal application of the objector afresh within one month period in the line of findings given in the judgment dtd.6.3.2020. (This may be examined).
2. Sri B.R.Behera, owner of vehicle No.OD05AQ-4249 is represented by Advocate Sri P.K.Behera. He stated that he has applied in same route and slot in serial No.282.

Application of the applicant may be considered if he has applied in any vacant slot.

This may be examined and heard jointly with sl.No.282 and considered on merit.

281. ROUTE- CUTTACK TO UTTARAPADA VIA CHANDIKHOLE, KENDRAPARA

AND BACK, MANORAMA SAHOO, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OR05AN-1505.

Applicant is absent.

There is an objection filed by Sri M.M.Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OD05AT-9314 through Advocate Sri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that this objector has also applied in same slot vide serial No.314.

This may be heard jointly with sl.No.314 and considered on merit.

282. **ROUTE-KAMALADIHA TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA BADAMBA ,**
ATHAGARH AND BACK, BICHITRA RANJAN BEHERA, OWNER OF
VEHICLE NO.OD05AQ-4249.

This may be heard jointly with sl.No.282 and considered on merit.

283. **ROUTE-SUBALAYA TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA BADAMBA ,**
ATHAGARH AND BACK, BICHITRA RANJAN BEHERA, OWNER OF
VEHICLE NO.OD05AN-4249.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri P.K.Behera. He stated that he has applied in vacant slots i.e. slot No.64 from Narasinghpur and slot No.72 from Cuttack.

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

284. **ROUTE-BALASORE TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA SORO , BHADRAK**
AND BACK, DURGA PERIWAL, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OR01R-
8987.

Applicant is absent. Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Sri D.K.Dey, owner of vehicle No.OD01AA-5757 is represented by Advocate K.Mohammad. He stated that There is clash of time at Balasore i.e. at 12.08 which is same time applied by the applicant.
2. Sk.Nurujzama, owner of vehicle No.OD01P-8475 stated that there is ✓ clash of time at Bhadrakh. His dep. time from Bhadrakh is at 14.03hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart at 14.07hrs. which is just four minutes after his service.

Since the route is under rationalization process, this should not be considered.

285. **ROUTE-SULIAPADA TO KHURDHA VIA GANDHI CHHAK , BALASORE AND**

BACK, JAYANTA KUMAR BEHERA, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO OD01U-1522.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri S.Mishra. He stated that the applicant has applied to ply his service as night service.

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

286. ROUTE-BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO BARIPADA VIA BHADRAK , SORO AND BACK, DILJOE ALAM, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO.OD05AP-5077.

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

1. Madhusmita Barik, owner of vehicle No.OD05W-3699 is represented by Advocate Sri D.B.Das and Associates. He stated that there is clash time at Bhadrak. He further stated that since the rationalization of timing is under process, the applicant may not be given TP.
2. Mirza Gousar Alli, owner of vehicle No.OD05V-0717 stated that there is clash of time in up trip from Bhadrak.

Since the rationalization of timings on the above route is under process, this should not be considered.

287. ROUTE-BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO BARIPADA VIA BHADRAK , SORO AND BACK, DILJOE ALAM, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO OD05AM-9277.

Since the rationalization of timings on the above route is under process, this should not be considered.

288. ROUTE-BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO BARIPADA VIA CHANDIKHOLE , BHADRAK AND BACK, MADHUSMITA BARIK, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO.. OD05AP-3799.

Applicant is absent.

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Sri Ram Chandra Mohapatra, owner of vehicle No.OD11C-2799 stated that at Cuttack, his service is departing at 10.20hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 10.20hrs. which is same time.
2. Sri Tushar Mohapatra, owner of vehicle No.OD11F-7299 is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the applicant has proposed to depart Bhubaneswar at 20.55hrs. whereas



his service is departing at 21.00 which is just five minutes ahead of his service. He further stated that since the route applied by the applicant is under rationalization of timing process, the application of the applicant may not be considered.

3. Sri Subal Ch. Das, owner of vehicle No.OR11L-0339 is represented by Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. He stated that at Baripada, his service is departing at 22.00hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart at 21.50hrs. which is just ten minutes ahead of his service. Applicant may be given after his service.

Since the route is under rationalization of timing process, this is not to be considered.

289. ROUTE-PARALAKHEMUNDI TO BALASORE VIA RAMBHA , KHURDHA AND BACK, DEBABRATA SAHU, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OD05P-3231.

Applicant is present.

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Sri K.K.Mohapatara, owner of vehicle No.OD22H-3772 is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the applicant has applied to depart Bhubaneswar and Cuttack at 2.55hrs. and 4.00 respectively whereas his service is departing from above two points at 3.35 and 4.45hrs. respectively Applicant has applied just forty minutes and fortyfive minutes ahead of his service from Bhubaneswar and Cuttack respectively. He further stated that the portion of the applied route by applicant covers the rationalized portion from Bhubaneswar to Balasore.
2. Sri J.K.Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OD07R-8141 is represented by Advocate Sri K.Mohammad. He stated that at Berhampur, the departure time of the service of this objector is 4.20hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 4.10hrs. which is just ten minutes ahead of his service. The common corridor is from Berhampur to Khajuripada which is 125 kms. Applicant stated that he has proposed to ply as express service, whereas the service of this objector is ordinary service. Hence, this objection should not be taken into consideration.

This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time and also verification of rationalization portion of the route.

290. ROUTE-BARIPADA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA SORO, BHADRAK AND BACK, RAJESH KUMAR PERIWAL, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO.OD01B-1187.

Applicant is represented by Advocate K.Mohammad.

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Susamarani Biswal, owner of vehicle No.OD01U-0888 is represented by Advocate Sri D.B.Das. He stated that her service is departing Balasore at 7.28hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 7.22hrs. which is just six minutes ahead of her service.
2. Sri Maheswar Mishra, owner of vehicle No.OD11Q-6161 is represented by Advocate Sri J.N.Mohanty. He stated that since the route is under rationalization of timing process, the applicant may not be allowed TP on the route.

Since the route is under rationalisation process, this should not be considered.

291. ROUTE-NAKSARA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA PATNA , MALIPOSI AND BACK, MANJULATA ROUT, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OR05AT-3663.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri S.Mishra. He stated that he has applied to ply his service as night service. Wrongly he has mentioned his departure time from Naksara i.e. starting point as 7.45hrs. which will be 19.45hrs. He further mentioned that Saharapada to Patna is only 16kms. whereas OPMS is taking 70 kms. Similarly, Patna to Maliposi is six kms. but OPMS is taking as 67 kms. which may be verified.

Following vehicle owners i.e. Anup Kumar Mohanty, owner of vehicle No.OR11E-4637, Sri B.N.Das, owner of vehicle No.OD11A-1110 and Sri P.C.Mohanty, owner of vehicle No.OR05AS-0565 have filed their objections. But, when applicant stated that his service will operate as night service, then the above objectors have no objections.

Applicant shall submit a revised timing accordingly which may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

292. ROUTE-BARIPADA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA SORO , BHADRAK AND BACK, RASHMIREKHA MOHANTY, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO.OD04P-1696.

Applicant is present.

Application shall be disposed of as per the observations made in sl.No.290.

293. ROUTE-BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO JAGAMOHANPUR VIA PANDUA , SANDA AND BACK, SANTOSH KUMAR MOHAPATRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OR06J-4117.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri S.Mishra.

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Sri B.B.Dhalasamanta, owner of vehicle No.OD05E-1111 stated that there is clash of time at Dhenkanal. His departure time from Dhenkanal is at 17.00hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at exact time to leave Dhenkanal. He stated that the applicant may be given time after his service i.e. ten minutes after his service. Accordingly, applicant has submitted a revised timings.
2. Sasmita Das, owner of vehicle No.OD35E-0036 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that his service is departing Bhubaneswar at 5.15hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to leave Bhubaneswar at 5.00hrs. Hence, he has requested that the applicant may be given time after his service. But on time table given by the applicant, it is ascertained that applicant has applied to leave Bhubaneswar at 5.30hrs. which is after the service of this objector.

Applicant may be considered TP deleting Manguli stoppage and subject to clash free timings. Accordingly, applicant will submit a revised timings deleting Manguli Chhak stoppage.

294. **ROUTE-BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO JAMUNAKOTE VIA PANDUA , JIRAL AND BACK, PRAMOD PATRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO.OR05AH-5225.**

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

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Sasmita Das, owner of vehicle No.OD35E-0036 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.Rao. He stated that there is clash of time at Bhubaneswar. His departure time from Bhubaneswar is 5.15hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart at same time i.e. at 5.15hrs.
2. Amrita Deo, owner of vehicle No.OD05L-1276 is represented by her Power of Attorney Holder Sri Jayant Kumar Sahoo. He stated that there is clash of time at Cuttack which is exact time of this objector. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be given after her service.
3. Smt. B.L.Swain, owner of vehicle No.OR06H-7317 is represented by Advocate Sri S.Mishra. He stated that at Dhenkanal, there is clash of time. Her service is departing Dhenkanal at 13.40hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 13.51hrs. which is just eleven minutes after her service. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be given after her service.

The above objector also stated that she has got another vehicle

bearing No.OR06F-3717 which departure time from Dhenkanal is 13.50hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 13.51 which is just one minute after his service.

Applicant stated that he will submit a revised timing to operate his vehicle via Dhableswar.

This may be considered subject to submission of revised timings by the applicant via Dhableswar as well as clash free time.

295. ROUTE-.MOHANA TO BERHAMPUR VIA BHISMAGIRI , DENGUSTA AND BACK, JITENDRA BEHERA, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO. OR07M-5155.

Applicant is present.

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Sri J.K.Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OD07F-8141 is represented by Advocate K.Mohammed. He stated that at Digapahandi, there is clash of time. His service is departing Digapahandi at 8.41hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 8.45hrs. which is four minutes after his service. At Berhampur, the applicant has applied to leave two minutes ahead of his service. His service is departing Berhampur at 11.25hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 11.23hrs. Applicant may be given timing after his service.
2. Sri R.K.Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OR07C-5369 stated that at Meghajholi, there are two roads from Mohana to Tikrapada. One is via Dengaosta and another is via Digapahandi. There is clash of time at Berhampur i.e. his service is departing at 10.45hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 11.23hrs. Since, the gap is 38 minutes and also is after his service, this may be examined.
3. Sri Ram Chandra Dora, is presented by Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. He stated that his service is departing Berhampur at 17.15hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart at 17.13hrs. which is just two minutes ahead of his service He requested that the applicant may be given after his service.
4. Sri M.K.Panigrahi, owner of vehicle No.OR07J-2770 stated that there is clash of time at Berhampur. His service is departing Berhampur at 11.30hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave at 11.23hrs. which is just seven minutes ahead of his service. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be asked to change his timings.

Besides, the above objectors (three objectors) have given online objections which is same as mentioned above.

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

296. **ROUTE-OLMARA TO BAISINGA VIA RUPSA , FULADI AND BACK,**
HIMANSHU SEKHAR SENAPATI, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO.OR11D-7311.

Applicant is present.

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

297. **ROUTE-BURLA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA BATAGAON ,**
CHADEIMARA AND BACK, BINOD BIHARI SAHU, OWNER OF
VEHICLE NO. OD28-5288.

Applicant is present.

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

298. **ROUTE-BHADRAK TO JEYPORE VIA SONEPUR , BOLANGIR AND BACK,**
MR SOURABH RANJAN PRADHAN, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO
OD05AV-0015.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri K.C.Das. He stated that this is alter service of sl.No.299.

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Sri Surendra Mohanty, owner of vehicle No.OD02D-7857 and OD02C-7857 stated that he is operating his above two services on the route Cuttack to Chandahandi and Bhubaneswar to Bhawanipatna respectively. His departure timings at Bhubaneswar in respect of his above two vehicles are at 20.45 and 20.55hrs. respectively whereas the applicants in sl.No.298 and 299 have applied timing between the timing of his above two services i.e. at 20.06hrs. But he has not given the copy of his timing for verification.

Since the gap is adequate between the services of applicant as well as this objector, the objection raised by the objector has no merit.

299. **ROUTE-BHADRAK TO JEYPORE VIA SONEPUR , BOLANGIR AND BACK,**
SARATCHANDRA PRADHAN, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO.OD05AH-0015.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri K.C.Das. He stated that this is alter service of sl.No.298.


This may be disposed of as per the observations given in sl.No.298.

300.**ROUTE-CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) TO JAMBU VIA TINI MUHANI ,**
KENDRAPARA AND BACK, RAMESH KUMAR DASH, OWNER OF
VEHICLE NO.OR16C-2250.

Applicant is present. There is no objection. Applicant stated that he has applied in vacant slot No.11 in category-A and in down trip slot No.213.

Applicant stated that this is an existing route and the permit has been expired and he has applied afresh.

Vacant slot given by the applicant may be verified and considered subject to verification of clash free time.


20.4.2020
Transport Commissioner-Cum-Chairman,
STA, Odisha, Cuttack.