

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, CUTTACK ON 07TH, MARCH, 2020.

101. ROUTE- KISINDA TO ATTHAMALLIK VIA KISHORNAGAR, TOSAR AND BACK, SUVENDU KU DASH, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD19B-0507.

Applicant is present.

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

102. ROUTE- BHETBAR TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA RANAPUR, SIKO AND BACK, SAHOO NABAKISHORE, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02-8462.

Applicant is present.

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

103. ROUTE- SANJAMURA TO BADMAL VIA JUJUMURA, SAMBALPUR AND BACK, NARESH KUMAR MISHRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD15D-0755.

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

There is no objection. It will be checked if he had P.P. earlier. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

104. ROUTE- BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO BHANJANAGAR VIA ODAGAON, ROHIBANKA AND BACK, CHANDRAMA PATRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02BE-9701.

Applicant is represented by her husband Sri R.K.Patra.

There is an objection filed by Shri Bichitra Chhualsingh, owner of vehicle No.OD02J-5127 through Advocate Shri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that there is clash of time at Bhubaneswar, Ranapur, Godipada, Sarankul and Odagaon. The departure time of objector's vehicle at the above points are 7.35hrs, 9.20hrs., 10.01hrs., 10.18hrs and 10.45hrs. whereas the proposed timings given by the applicant at above five points are 7.25hrs, 9.16hrs., 9.59hrs, 10.37hrs and 11.42hrs. The proposed timing given by the applicant at Bhubaneswar, Ranapur and Godipada is ahead of the service of the objector i.e. 10minutes, 4 minutes and 2 minutes gap, whereas from

Sarankul point onwards, applicant has proposed jumping timing after service of the objector which is a gap of 19 minutes and 57 minutes.

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

105. ROUTE- CHAHALI TO NAYAGARH VIA BANIGOCHHA, JAMUSAHI AND BACK, KABITA SWAIN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR13D-3357.

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

Following two objectors have filed their objections:

1. Sri Pulin Bihari Pattnaik, owner of vehicle No.OD25A-1545 is represented by Advocate Sri S.Mishra. He stated that there is clash of time at Chakapada in up trip and at Nayagarh in down trip. His dep. time at Chakapada is 7.15hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed at 6.30hrs. which is 45 minutes ahead of his service. In down trip at Nayagarh, his departure time is 12.00hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 11.15hrs. which is also 45 minutes gap. He also stated that though the applicant has proposed to depart his vehicle 45 minutes ahead of his service, but in middle point the timing given by the applicant comes down i.e. 21minutes at Dasapalla in down trip. Similarly in up trip, the timing proposed by applicant at Banigochha comes down to 26 minutes.

2. Sri Rakesh Kumar Das, owner of vehicle No.OR04N-2755 is represented by Advocate Sri S. Mishra. He stated that the applicant has proposed to depart from Dasapalla in up trip is twenty minutes ahead of his service. Hence it will hamper the smooth functioning of his service.

The applicant has proposed to ply his vehicle as express service and objectors are plying their vehicle as ordinary service, and the objections raised by the objectors have to be considered in this context.

Application of the applicant may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

106. ROUTE- KANTABANJI TO UMARKOTE VIA KOKSARA, AMPANI AND BACK, NILAKANTHA DAS, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR08F-7611.

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

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

107. ROUTE- GUALI TO ROURKELA VIA RAKSHI, LAHUNIPARA AND BACK, PRALAYA KUMAR MOHANTY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR14V-0910.

Applicant is present.

There is an objection filed by Sri Rakesh Kumar Pradhan, owner of vehicle No.OD14T-7079 and OD14N-5179 through Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that his client is operating above two vehicles on the route Kundaposh to Rourkela, Rourkela to Ranga in respect of vehicle No.OD14T-7079. His another vehicle No.OD14N-5179 is plying on the route Bandhposh to Rourkela and back. His first service is departing Rourkela at 9.00hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 8.35hrs. He further stated that since the applicant proposed departure timing at 17.20hrs. from Rourkela, it reaches Rourkela at 14.51 but waits there for more than two hours and thirty minutes to depart just ten minutes ahead of the service of Objector. The common corridor is Rourkela to Rangra.

It is decided that the halting time at Rourkela point may be reduced.

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

108. ROUTE- KUCHINDA TO SUNDARGARH VIA JHARSUGUDA AND BACK, BIJAYA KUMAR SAHU, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD23J-5769.

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

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Shri S.K.Patel, owner of vehicle No.OD15G-5977 stated that his vehicle is plying on the route Kuchinda to Jharsuguda. The timing applied by the applicant is exact timing of his service. But he has not mentioned the timing of his service in the petition.
2. Shri G.R.Hota, owner of vehicle No.OD15C-5566 is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the route is covering rationalised route from Jharsuguda to Sundargarh. This objector is plying his bus as per the timings of rationalised route and slot allotted to him. He further stated that there is direct clash of time at Sundargarh point i.e. at 9.20hrs. Besides, the dep. time proposed by the applicant at Jharsuguda at 7.20hrs. is also clashing with the timing of another vehicle No.OR23E-3888. In the second trip, the proposed timing given by the applicant at Jharsuguda at 15.50hrs. is also clashing directly in respect of vehicle No.OR16-9792 and lastly

the proposed timing of applicant at Sundargarh point at 16.55hrs. is also clashing with the timing of vehicle No.OR23D-6205 which is exact time. This vehicle is plying from Sundargarh to Burla on rationalized route. Hence, he requested that applicant may be given in any vacant slot.

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

109. **ROUTE-** KARLAGHATI TO NABARANGPUR VIA RAYAGADA, LAXMIPUR AND BACK, K BHUJANGA RAO, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD18D-8649.

Applicant is present.

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

110. **ROUTE-** ANGUL TO BOLANI VIA TALCHER, KEONJHAR AND BACK, GHANASHYAM MAHANTA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR09Q-8621.

Applicant is present. He stated that he has applied TP to ply as alter service of OD09F-7734.

There is an objection filed by Sri S.K.Sahoo, owner of vehicle No.OD19A-4097 through Advocate Sri S.Mishra. He stated that the applicant has applied TP as alter service of OD09F-7734. Earlier, he has filed objection before the Secretary,STA which is under consideration. He further stated that the timings proposed by the applicant do not show in OPMS. The proposed timing given by the applicant is directly clashing at Pallahada and Talcher point.

This may be verified.

111. **ROUTE-** PITALA TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA KHALIKOTE CHHAK , BALUGAON AND BACK, BHASKAR CHHATAI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR04M-7984.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. He withdrew the application. His application is rejected.

112. **ROUTE-** PADAMPUR TO BHAWANIPATANA VIA GUDIGHAT, MURIBAHAL AND BACK, SAMARENDRA KUMAR PANDA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD17Q-5568.

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

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



113. ROUTE- CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) TO KAIJHAR VIA GALLERY, BADANGI AND BACK, SNEHALATA RAY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02AC-1151.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri K.C.Das. He stated that the applicant has applied TP to ply his vehicle as night service and also as alter service of SI.No.22.

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

114. ROUTE- TIARIGAN TO BHAWANIPATANA VIA KURTAMGADA, TUMUDIBANDHA AND BACK, RAKESH KUMAR SAHU, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD12B-8497.

Applicant is present. He stated that this is alter service of sl.No.115.

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Shri B.K.Dakua, owner of vehicle No.OR18B-1034 and Krushnapriya Dakua, owner of vehicle No.OR12-4321 are represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that at Baliguda, there is clash of time in respect of timing of vehicle No.OR18B-1034. The service of objector is departing Baliguda at 12.02hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 11.45hrs. which is just seventeen minutes ahead of his service. Hence he has requested that the applicant may be allowed to ply his vehicle after his service at Baliguda and time gap may be maintained.

As regards objection of the another operator Krushnapriya Dakua, he stated that at Daringibadi, the time gap is only twenty minutes. Her service is departing Daringibadi at 9.30hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 9.20hrs. which is ten minutes ahead of her service. The objector stated that the applicant may be given time after her service.

It is decided that the applicant may be given time at 9.00hrs. to leave Daringibadi instead of 9.20hrs. and time gap to be maintained.

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

115. ROUTE- TIARIGAN TO BHAWANIPATANA VIA KURTAMGADA, TUMUDIBANDHA AND BACK, SAHOO DOLAGOBINDA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD12C-1679.

Applicant is present and stated that this is alter service of SI.No.114.

This may be dealt at par with observations made in sl.No.114.

116. ROUTE- LAING TO BUDHI KUDAR VIA KUARMUNDA, KHUKHUNDIABAHAL AND BACK, KASTUBHA BHUSAN HOTA, OWNER OF VEHICLE CG14A-3862.

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

Since, the vehicle belongs to other State Registration, this is not to be considered for TP.

There is one objection filed by Sri Minaketan Mohanty, owner of vehicle No.OD14-6933 through Advocate Sri Santanu Das. Hence, the objection filed by this objector is of no meaning.

117. ROUTE- BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO PHULABANI VIA KHANDAPARA, DASHAPALLA AND BACK, BIKASH KUMAR NAYAK, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02BG-7406.

Applicant is present.

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Sri A.K. Routray, owner of vehicle No.OR11G-3535 is represented by Advocate Shri S. Mishra. He stated that at Bhubaneswar, there is clash of time. His departure time at Bhubaneswar is 4.25hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Bhubaneswar at 4.15hrs. which is just ten minutes ahead of his service. He further stated that the clash of time is continuing from Bhubaneswar to Dasapalla which is 125 kms. He requested that applicant may be given time after his service.
2. Manjubala Prusty, owner of vehicle No.OD25-8299 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.K,Rao. He stated that the suggested timing given by the applicant at Bhubaneswar point at 4.15hrs. is clashing with his timing. His service is departing Bhubaneswar at 4.35hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 4.15hrs. which is twenty minutes ahead of his service. The common corridor is from Bhubaneswar to Phulbani (although on different alignment). Secondly, he stated that earlier the departure time 4.15hrs. at Bhubaneswar was allotted to another vehicle No.OD33T-1212 and on the basis of objection filed by this objector and others, the said time has been revised to 05.30hrs. Hence, again allotment of same departure time to the present applicant would be unjustified.
3. Sri S.C.Nayak, owner of vehicle No.OR16C-1350 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that at Madhapur and Dasapalla, there is clash of time. His service is departing Madhpur at 12.55hrs. and Dasapalla at 14.00hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 12.35hrs. and 13.45hrs. just twenty minutes and fifteen

minutes respectively ahead of his service. Hence, he requested that the timing given by the applicant may be revised and applicant may be given timing after his service.

4. Sri Manoj Mohapatra, owner of vehicle No.OR25C-4261 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that there is clash of time at Phulbani. His dep. time at Phulbani is 11.40hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 11.35hrs. just five minutes ahead of his service. The common corridor is from Phulbani to Dasapalla. Hence he requested that the applicant may be given timing after his service. The halting time given to this vehicle at Gania, Dasapalla and Madhapur is 16minutes, forty minutes and twenty minutes respectively which may be reduced.

5. Sri S.K.Jena, husband of Sonali Jena, owner of vehicle No.OD02AH-8004 stated that there is clash of time at Dasapalla. His vehicle is departing Dasapalla at 7.44hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to leave at 7.36hrs. just eight minutes ahead of his service. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be given time after his service.

Applicant suggested that he may be given departure time from Bhubaneswar at 4.45hrs. This time may be given subject to verification of clash free time. Applicant further stated that the vehicle No.OR25C-4261 is not plying at all on the route though permit has been granted. This may be verified.

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

118. ROUTE- BERHAMPUR TO GUDARI VIA MOHANA, ADAVA AND BACK, SMT .LILI KUMARI BISOI, OWNER OF VEHICLE AP02TC-7310.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri M.B.K.Rao. Since this is an other State Vehicle, this is not to be considered.

119. ROUTE- BHUBAN TO TALCHER VIA KAMAKHYANAGAR PWD, PARJANG AND BACK, KARTIK CHANDRA GHOSH, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD01X-6867.

Applicant is present.

There is an objection filed by Sri S.Samal, owner of vehicle No.OR06D-7527 through Advocate Sri S.Mishra. He stated that in the 2nd up trip from Bhuban there is clash of time. His service is departing Bhubaneswar at 11.25hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart at 11.24hrs. which is only one minute ahead of his service. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be given ten minutes after his service.

120. **ROUTE-** BIRMITRAPUR BORDER TO ROURKELA AND BACK, SAROJ KUMAR SAHOO, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR14S-2768.

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

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Sri Samar Mohanty, owner of vehicle No.OD14H-5799 is represented by Advocate Shri Santanu Das. He stated that there is clash of time at Biramitrapur. His dep. time at Biramitrapur is 14.30hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart Biramitrapur at 14.20hrs. which is just ten minutes ahead of his service. He stated that the applicant may be given after his service.
2. Shri A.Viswakarma, owner of vehicle No.OR14N-8211 is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that this objector is plying his vehicle from Rourkela to Nuagaon under RTA permit issued by RTA, Rourkela. But the present applicant has proposed to ply his vehicle on the route Biramitrapur to Rourkela which is coming under the jurisdiction of only one region i.e. RTO, Rourkela. **This may be verified.** He stated that, at Rourkela, there is clash of time. His vehicle is departing Rourkela at 12.05hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart Rourkela at 12.00hrs. which is just five minutes ahead of his service. He further stated that though the applicant proposed to leave Biramitrapur just five minutes ahead of his service, but reaches one minute prior to his service. Hence, he requested that the route and timings applied for by the applicant may not be considered as it covers one region.
3. Sri Batia Lakra, owner of vehicle No.OD14G-9559 is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that at Rourkela, there is clash of time. His service is departing Rourkela at 17.20hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Rourkela at 17.15hrs. which is only five minutes ahead of his service. Hence, he requested that the route and timings applied for by the applicant may not be considered as it covers one region. If considered, the applicant may be given time after his service.
4. Md.Fakarudin, owner of vehicle No.OD14C-1658 and No.OD14M-2094 is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that at Biramitrapur, there is clash of time. His service OD14M-2094 is departing Biramitrapur at 4.35hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart at 4.25hrs. just ten minutes ahead of his service. Similarly, in another trip, there is clash of time at Biramitrapur in respect of his another vehicle No. OD14C-1658. His departure time at Biramitrapur is 10.14hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 10.07hrs. which is just seven minutes ahead of his

service. Hence, he requested that the route and timings applied for by the applicant may not be considered as it covers one region. If considered, then the applicant may be given time after his service.

Besides, there above objectors have also filed online objections.

It is decided that the route applied by the applicant may be verified whether it covers only one region. If so, this should not be considered. In case the applied route covers more than one region, this may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

121. ROUTE- BARBIL TO ROURKELA VIA BIMLAGARH, LAHUNIPARA AND BACK, RAJU ORAM, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR14V-9003.

Applicant is absent.

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Sri P.K.Swain, owner of vehicle No.OR14Q-5474 is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that there is clash of time from Rourkela up to Barbil. He is operating his service on the route Bambari to Rourkela whereas the applicant has applied on the route Barbil to Rourkela. His dep. time at Rourkela is 15.45hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 15.35hrs. just ten minutes ahead of his service. Though the applicant proposed to depart Rourkela just 10 minutes ahead of his service, but proposed to reach Barbil 54 minutes after his service which is irrational timings. Hence, he has requested that applicant may be given time after his service. He has also given an online objection.

2. Sri R.K.Pradhan, owner of vehicle No.OD14M-6174 is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that in up trip, there is clash of time at Lahunipada. His dep. time at Lahunipada is 6.10hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to leave at 6.04hrs. which is just six minutes ahead of his service. Similarly, in down trip, his service is departing from Lahunipada at 13.05hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart at 13.05hrs. which is exact timing of the objector.

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

122. ROUTE- ARGAL TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA KUAKHIA, CHANDIKHOLE AND BACK, PRATAP CH BEHERA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR19G-6321.

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

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Shri S.K.Mohanty, owner of vehicle No.OD05M-2260 is represented by Advocate Shri S. Mishra. He stated that, in down trip, there is clash of time at from Cuttack is just five minutes after his service. Hence, the entire route from Cuttack to Chandikhole, the time is clashing. He further stated that the route applied by the applicant is under rationalisation process. Hence, he has requested that the T.P. may not be considered.

2. Shri D.K.Misha, owner of vehicle OR05P-3549 stated that at Cuttack there is clash of time. His service is departing Cuttack at 11.30hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 11.25hrs. There is common corridor of 90kms. He also stated that this route is under rationalization process. Hence, TP may not be considered in favour of the applicant.

3. Sri Vijayananda Dwibedi, owner of vehicle No.OD05W-5257 stated that there is clash of time at Singhpur. His departure time at Singhpur is 6.20hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Singhpur at 5.50hrs. which is thirty minutes ahead of his service. He further stated that the route applied by the applicant is under rationalisation process. Hence, he has requested that the T.P. may not be considered.

4. Sk.Masud, owner of vehicle No.OR04A-3255 stated that there is clash of time. His dep. time from Cuttack is 11.30hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to leave Cuttack at 11.25hrs. just five minutes ahead of his service.

The application of the applicant may not be considered, since the route is under rationalization process.

123. ROUTE- PADMAPUR TO JEYPORE VIA RAYAGADA, LAXMIPUR AND BACK, K BHUJANGA RAO, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR18C-8649.

Applicant is present.

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

124. ROUTE- NUTOCHHAK TO BALASORE VIA KAPTIPADA, UDALA AND BACK, BIBEKANANDA RAJ, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR22E-5673.

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

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



125. **ROUTE-** ANTARAPARHA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA GODIPADA, DARPANARAYANPUR AND BACK, NABAKISHOR SAHOO, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02AV-1370.

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

There is an objection filed by Sri Birendra Patra, owner of vehicle No.OD02AN-8523 through Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. He stated that there is clash of time at Bhubaneswar. His departure time from Bhubaneswar is 16.07hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart Bhubaneswar at 15.35hrs. which is 32 minutes ahead of his service. Since, there is time gap is 32 minutes between objector's time and proposed time of the applicant, the objection raised by the objector has no merit for consideration.

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

126. **ROUTE-** BERHAMPUR TO BANPUR VIA BUDHAMBHA, KODALA AND BACK, SK PARAVAJ ILLAHI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD07V-8786.

Applicant is present.

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

127. **ROUTE-** BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO SINAPALI, VIA BOUDH, BOLANGIR AND BACK, SUNITA TANDI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD26A-9877.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri J.N.Mohanty. He stated that applicant has applied to ply his vehicle from on the above route. He will start from Bhubaneswar to Cuttack and then Cuttack to Sinapali.

It is decided that applicant should ply his vehicle from Bhubaneswar to Sinapali without covering Cuttack. Accordingly, he will submit the revised timing with departure time from Bhubaneswar at 19.30hrs. instead of 21.25hrs. Applicant is agreed to it and stated that he will submit the modified timing accordingly.

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

128. **ROUTE-** RAMANKUL TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA RAJENDRAPUR CHHAK, PANIKOILI AND BACK, PRADEEP KUMAR PATRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05AS-8080.

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

There is an objection filed by Sri Priyabrata Tripathy, owner of vehicle No.OD05AV-4149. He stated that there is clash of time at Cuttack. His service is departing Cuttack at 16.55hrs. whereas the applicant has also proposed to depart Cuttack at 16.55hrs. which is same time. In this regard, he has requested that either the applicant may be given departure time from Cuttack ten minutes after his service or it may be given 16.25hrs. instead of 16.55hrs.

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

129. ROUTE- ANALA TO JAJPUR ROAD VIA BHUBAN, DUBURI AND BACK, DILLIP KUMAR AGRAWALLA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR19D-0772.

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

There is one objection filed by Shri Shreekanta Sastry, owner of vehicle No.OR04E-6277 through Advocate Sri S.Mishra. He stated that in first down trip at Jajpur Road, the time is clashing. His departure time at Jajpur Road is 9.10hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed at 8.55hrs. which is fifteen minutes ahead of his service and the entire route from Jajpur Road to Bhuban is being clashed. Hence he requested that the applicant may be given time 20 minutes after his service from Jajpur Road.

Applicant requested that he may be allowed to depart Jajpur Road at 8.50hrs.

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

130. ROUTE- ALIANTI TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA KUANPAL, JAYPUR AND BACK, KARTTIK CHANDRA SAHU, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR15R-6754.

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

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Shri Harihar Nath, owner of vehicle No.OD05T-1552 stated that at Kuanpal, there is clash of time. His departure time at Kuanpal is 7.00hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 6.40hrs i.e. twenty minutes ahead of his service. Hence he requested that the applicant may be given time after 7.00hrs. or before 6.00hrs.
2. Smt. Mamatarani Rout, owner of vehicle No.OD05AC-8736 and No.OD05G-7736 is represented by her husband Sri Pareswar Rout. He stated that there is clash of time at Jaypur in respect of her vehicle OD05AC-8736. Her departure time at Jayapur is 6.59hrs.

whereas the applicant has applied at 6.55hrs. which is four minutes ahead of her service. Similarly, the departure time of her another vehicle OD05G-7736 at Balichandrapur is at 6.45hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 6.20hrs. which is twenty-five minutes ahead of her service. Since, the time gap is twenty five minutes gap, this objection should not be considered.

3. Sri Govind Chandra Swain, owner of vehicle No. OR05R-3175 stated that at Kuanpur, his departure time is 14.40hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 14.24hrs. Similarly at Cuttack, his dep. time is 16.45hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 16.35 which is ten minutes gap. It may be verified whether this vehicle has got a valid permit.

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

131. ROUTE- NUAPATANA TO BOLANGIR VIA DASHAPALLA, TAKARA AND BACK, SUDHAKAR SAHOO, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR02BG-7857.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri S. Mishra..

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

132. ROUTE- PHULABANI TO SONEPUR VIA LUISINGI, MATAKUPA AND BACK, SUDARSANA DIGAL, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR25C-2605.

Applicant is present.

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

133. ROUTE- JEYPORE TO PARICHIPARA VIA PAPADAHANDI, DABUGAM AND BACK, MOHESWAR BISOI OD10N-5985.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri P.K. Behera. He withdrew his application.

134. ROUTE- BELI TO BADASAHI VIA BALASORE, REMUNA AND BACK, SK. ANSAR, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD01Q-2386.

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

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Sri R.K. Mohanty, owner of vehicle No. OD22D-2772 is represented by Advocate Sri J.N. Mohanty. He stated that at Kuamara, his service is departing at 13.30hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 13.15hrs. which is fifteen minutes ahead

of his service. Similarly, at Remuna, his service is departing at 14.15hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 14.20 after five minutes of the service of this objector. At Balasore in down trip, objector's bus arrives at 14.30 and departs at 14.40 whereas the applicant has proposed to arrive Balasore at 14.32hrs and depart at 15.00hrs. Objector have no objection in Balasore time. At Remuna towards Balasore in downtrip, the objector's vehicle arrives at 14.10 and departs at 14.15 whereas the applicant has proposed the same arrival time i.e. 14.10 and departure time at 14.20hrs which is almost the same time at Remuna. Hence, he has requested that the timing of the applicant may be modified atleast 30 to 40 minutes after his service.

2. Sri Tapas Kumar Mohanty, owner of vehicle No.OD01G-2626 stated that at Balasore, his departure time is 8.30 whereas the applicant has applied at 8.20 just ten minutes ahead of his service. At Durgadevi, his bus is departing at 9.10 hrs. whereas the applicant has applied 9.15hrs. and at Kuamara, his service is departing at 9.42hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 9.45hrs. which is just three minutes after his service. Hence, he requested that applicant may be given timing after his service.

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

135. ROUTE- UDALA TO KEONJHAR VIA MACHHAGARH, SAHARAPADA AND BACK, SABITA RANI MISHRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD09F-2637.

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

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Shri Sudhir Chandra Behera, owner of vehicle No.OD11A-3668 and OD11A-1198 stated that there is clash of time at Udala point in respect of his vehicle No.OD11A-3668. His vehicle is departing Udala at 6.15hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart at 5.50hrs. i.e. 25 minutes ahead of his service. Similarly in down trip, the timing of his second vehicle i.e. OD11A-1198 is clashing at Machhagarh . His dep. time at Machhagarh is at 14.20hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 14.06hrs. which is fourteen minutes ahead of his service. At Saharapada, his dep. time is at 13.40hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 13.40hrs. which is exact time of the objector.

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



136. ROUTE- DEOBANDHA TO GADAPALASUNI VIA KEONJHAR, SUAKATI AND BACK, KUMUDINI MAHANTA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD09D-5694.

Applicant is absent. There is no objection.

137. ROUTE- MOTABADI TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA SHARANKULA, GODIPADA AND BACK, SRIDHAR PRADHAN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD25F-8552.

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

138. ROUTE- NAKSARA TO JINDAL VIA JAGAMOHANPUR, PALA LAHARHA AND BACK, AMIT KUMAR GIRI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05T-7209.

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

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Smt. B.Sahoo, owner of vehicle No.OR09N-8895 is represented by Advocate K.Mahammad. He stated that there is clash of time at Jindal. His dep. time at Jindal is at 4.25hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave at 4.10hrs just fifteen minutes ahead of his service. Similarly, at Angul and Nalco, applicant has proposed to leave twelve minutes ahead of his service. Similarly, applicant has proposed to depart Banarpal 22 minutes ahead, 3 minutes ahead at Talcher and eight minutes ahead at Samal and reache Palalahara at 7.39 and halts there for 30 minutes. Hence the applicant has proposed to halt at Palalahara for 30 minutes which is an unimportant stoppage. But practically the applicant will ply his bus ahead of this objector upto Keonjhar. It may be verified whether the service is ordinary or express. He suggested that the applicant may be given time after his service from Jindal up to Keonjhar with reasonable gap.

2. Sabitarani Mishra, owner of vehicle No.OD09Q-9437 is represented by Advocate Shri P.K.Behera. He stated that at Champua, her service is departing at 7.20hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave at 7.30hrs. which is ten minutes after her service. But the applicant is overtaking her service by reaching Keonjhar earlier than the timing of objector. It may be verified whether the applicant has proposed an irrational timing in which his vehicle shall depart Champua later than the timing of this objector and arrive Keonjhar earlier than the timing of the service of this objector.

3. Shri K.C.Dwibedy, owner of vehicle No.OR08C-4837 stated that he is plying his service on the route permit issued by RTA, Angul. His service is departing Palalahara at 12.20hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Palalahara five minutes ahead of his service. He further stated that another owner is plying his three vehicles on the route between 11.42hrs. to 12.15 hrs. He requested that the applicant may be given time after his service and halting time at Palalahada in respect of the proposed timing given by the applicant i.e. 48 minutes may be reduced.

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

139. ROUTE- BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO GERADA VIA BUGUDA, BALIPADAR AND BACK, ASHUTOSH SARANGI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02BC-2289.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.K.Rao.
Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Sri N.K.Amarka, owner of vehicle No.OR02BW-2111 stated that at Bhanjanagar in down trip, the applicant has proposed to leave after five minutes of the timing of applicant i.e. at 21.25hrs, at Balipadar which is 30 kms. distance, applicant overtakes his vehicle. Applicant stated that the alignment is different which may be verified. He has also given an online objection mentioning the above objection.

2. Sri B.K.Pattnaik, owner of vehicle No.OR17-F-7474 stated that he is operating in the routeBBSR to Gazalbadi via Bhanjanagar. His dep. time from BBSR is 10.25hrs. Bhanjanagar dep. time is 21.30 whereas the applicant has proposed to depart BBSR and Bhanjanagar at 10.25hrs. and 21.30hrs respectively which is exact time of this objector. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be given time after his service.

3. Sri S.K.Nayak, owner of vehicle No.OD02X-5429 stated that his departure time at Bhanjanagar towards Cuttack is at 21.40hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Bhanjanagar at 21.25hrs. which is just fifteen minutes ahead of his service. The common corridor is upto Bhubaneswar. Hence he requested that adequate gap may be maintained.

This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time and adequate time gap may be maintained.

140. ROUTE- KOINPUR TO BERHAMPUR RAILWAYSTN VIA CHANDRAGIRI, CHANDIPUT AND BACK, NIRANJAN NAYAK, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD07AD-5123.

Applicant is present. He stated that Berhampur Railway Station may be considered as Berhampur Bus Stand.



Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Swagatika Panigrahi, owner of vehicle No.OR02Z-2099 is represented by Advocate Shri N.P.Panda. He stated that the objector is plying her service on the route Kalakhandi to Berhampur via Seragada under a PP issued by RTA, Ganjam. The departure time of objectors' service from Berhampur is at 15.45hrs. whereas the applicant has also applied departure time at 15.45hrs. which is exact time. Hence he requested to change the dep. time proposed by the applicant at starting point at Berhampur.
2. Smt. L.Jena, owner of vehicle No.OR07W-4805 is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that at Berhampur point, his vehicle is starting at 16.00hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart at 15.45 which is fifteen minutes ahead of his service. The common corridor is from Berhampur to Luhagudi which is 60kms. He further stated that though the applicant's service leaves Berhampur fifteen minutes earlier than the timing of objector, it reaches Luhagudi 58 minutes after the service of objector which is irrational.
3. Sri J.K.Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OD07AA-8141 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that the departure time of this objector at Berhampur point is at 16.10hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to leave Berhampur at 15.45hrs. just twenty-five minutes ahead of his service. The common corridor is from Berhampur to Chheligada which is substantial portion of the route. Besides, the halting timing given by the applicant at Balipada is more than one hour and twenty minutes which is much more. This may be reduced.

It is decided that the case of applicant may be considered subject to verification of clash free time as well as reducing the halting time where the applicant has mentioned to halt much more time.

141. ROUTE- KARLAGHATI TO RAYAGADA VIA MUNIGUDA, BISSAM CUTTACK AND BACK, B RAM BABU, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD18D-0999.

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

This is an intra-region route. Entire route is under Rayagada Region.

Applicant may apply before the concerned RTA, Rayagada. Hence, grant of permit should not be considered.

Applicant stated that he will produce a revised route extending the route to another region. It is decided that if the applicant submits modified route and timing, this may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

142. ROUTE- BENISAGAR TO KEONJHAR VIA CHAMPUA, REMULI AND BACK, MANORANJAN MISHRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR09J-2069.

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

There is one objection filed by Md. Israr Ali, owner of vehicle No.OD09B-6817 through Advocate Shri Sabyasachi Mishra. He stated that at Keonjhar, there is clash of time. His service is departing Keonjhar at 13.05hr. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave at 12.47hrs. which is 18 minutes ahead of his service. The timing in entire route from Keonjhar to Naksara is clashing. Further he stated that the halting time proposed by the applicant at Keonjhar is more than 2 hours 23 minutes. He suggested that applicant may be given departure time from Keonjhar at 12.20hrs. Otherwise applicant may be allowed to ply his vehicle after his service and minimum 45 minutes gap may be maintained.

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

143. ROUTE- KARAMUL TO JAJPUR ROAD VIA DHANKA, KASIPUR CHHAKA AND BACK, GIRISH CHANDRA MOHANTY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR05AB-6685.

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

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

144. ROUTE- CHILIKHAMA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA KOMANDA, ODAGAON AND BACK, NALINI PRAVA MISHRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR02AV-2687.

Applicant is represented by her husband Sri Bijay Kumar Mishra.

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

145. ROUTE- KERADANGO TO BERHAMPUR VIA SINKULIPADAR, TALASINGI AND BACK, RAMA NARAYAN TRIPATHY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR07N-8282.

Applicant is represented by Advocate K.Mahammad. He stated that the suggested departure time as 15.45 from Berhampur has been suggested by another applicant mentioned in sl.No.140 and



there is another service to depart Berhampur at 15.42hrs. Hence, in order to avoid litigation, he wants to avail 14.48hrs. to depart Berhampur instead of 15.45hrs. which is vacant time. This may be verified.

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Sri J.K.Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OD07AA-8141 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that if the applicant shall revise his departure time from Berhampur i.e. at 14.48hrs. instead of 15.45, then he has no objection.
2. Smt. Laxmi Jena, owner of vehicle No.OR07W-4805 is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He also stated that if the applicant will revise his departure time from Berhampur i.e. at 14.48hrs. instead of 15.45, then he has no objection.
3. Swagatika Panigrahi, owner of vehicle No.OR02Z-2099 is represented by Advocate Sri N.P.Panda. He also stated that if the applicant revises his departure time from Berhampur i.e. at 14.48hrs. instead of 15.45, then he has no objection.

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

146. **ROUTE-** PAILIPARHA TO MASTERCANTEEN (CITY BUSSTAND) VIA POLASARA, KHALLIKOTE AND BACK, AMRIT PRASAD MISHRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD07V-7779.

Applicant is present. Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Sri B.N.Sahoo, owner of vehicle No.OR02BU-0320 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that there is clash of time at Polasara. His service is departing Polasara at 11.40hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Polasara at 11.40hrs. which is exact time of his service. The common corridor is from Bhubaneswar to Polasara.
2. Sri R.K.Behera, owner of vehicle No.OD02AN-6802 is represented by Advocate Sri S.Mishra. He stated that he is an applicant vide sl.No.72 wherein he has applied to ply his vehicle on the route Bhubaneswar to Gandhinagar and back via Khurda, Balugaon, Polasara and Balipadar. The same was taken up on dt.6.3.2020 and there was no objection which seems to be approved. The timing applied by the applicant in the up trip clashes with the timing of his service in the down trip at Balipadar which is just three minutes ahead of his service. The timing of entire route



from Balipadar to Bhubaneswar is being clashed. His departure time at Balipadar is 10.28hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 10.25hrs.

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

147. ROUTE- KEONJHAR TO JAMSOLA VIA JASHIPUR, BISOI AND BACK, DEBIPRASANNA MOHANTA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD11H-1767.

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

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Smt. B.Shoo, owner of vehicle No.OR09J-4805 replaced by OD09-5705 is represented by Advocate K.Mohammad. He stated that at Keonjhar, there is clash of time. Her service is departing Keonjhar at 7.15hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Keonjhar at 6.43hrs. The common corridor is Keonjhar to Jashipur which is 70kms. distance. Her service is plying as ordinary and proposed service of applicant is express service.

2. Sri K.C.Majhi, owner of vehicle No.OR09G-1887 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that at Keonjhar, there is clash of time. His service is departing Keonjhar at 6.45hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave at 6.43hrs. just two minutes ahead of his service. The common corridor is from Keonjhar to Jashipur. He is plying his service as ordinary service whereas the applicant has applied to ply as express service. Hence, he has requested that the applicant may be given time after his service.

3. Sri Suresh Chandra Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OD11H-1767 stated that there is clash of time at Keonjhar. His departure time from Keonjhar is 7.00hrs. whereas the applicant has applied 6.43hrs. just seven minutes ahead of his service. The common corridor is Keonjhar to Jharpokharia which is 150kms. distance. He has requested that the applicant may be given to leave Keonjhar half an hour before his timing.

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

148. ROUTE- PATHARA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA NACHUNI, CHANDAPUR AND BACK, SARANGADHAR SAHOO, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02AV-1777.

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

Following objectors have filed their objections:



1. Sri D.K.Harichandan, owner of vehicle No.OD02AP-2565 is represented by Advocate Shri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that at Chandpur, the departure time given by the applicant at 6.29 which is exact time of this objector. Hence he requested that the applicant may be allowed to leave Pathara i.e. at starting point after 4.00AM so that his timing shall not clash with the objector's service at Chandapur.

2. Sri J.K.Sahoo, owner of vehicle No.OD02AF-6054 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that at Bhubaneswar, there is clash of time. His departure time from Bhubaneswar is at 15.52hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave at 15.52hrs. which is exact time of this objector. He further stated that the Bhubaneswar departure time of 16.00hrs. was allotted to another vehicle to which the present objector filed objection and consequently said time was directed to be revised.

3. Sasmita Sahoo, owner of vehicle No.OD02AL-3132, OR02AU-6648 and OD02AC-3132 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that this objector is operating her above three vehicles on the route Banapur to Bhubaneswar, Bhimpur to Bhubaneswar and Badakhali to Bhubaneswar respectively. Her dep. time in respect of vehicle No.OD02AL-3132, OR02AU-6648 and OD02AC-3132 at Bhubaneswar are 15.55,16.05 and 16.12 respectively whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Bhubaneswar at 15.52 with gap of three minutes, thirteen minutes and twenty minutes respectively.

Hence, he has requested that the timing may be allotted to applicant maintaining adequate time gap.

4. Anupama Pattnaik, owner of vehicle No.OD02BE-9329 is represented by her husband Sri S.K.Pattnaik. He stated that in second trip at Balugaon, there is clash of time. Her dep. time at Balugaon is at 11.54hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 11.49 hrs. just five minutes ahead of her service and at Khurda two minutes ahead of her service.

5. Sasmita Sahoo, owner of vehicle No.OR02AS-0025 is represented by her husband Sri J.K.Sahoo. He stated that in second trip at Bhubaneswar her departure time is 9.20hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 9.22hrs. which two minutes after her service. The common corridor is Bhubaneswar to Balugaon which is 100 kms. distance. He requested that applicant may be given time with appropriate gap.

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

149. **ROUTE-** KAMPULEI TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA JIRAL, DHENKANAL AND BACK, SATYA NARAYAN MISHRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02AH-1899.

Applicant is present. There is no objection.

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

150. **ROUTE-** BOLANGIR TO BELKHANDI VIA DAHIMAL, GAJABAHAL AND BACK, JAGRUTI SAHU, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR23E-1787.

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

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

151. **ROUTE-** NTPC TOBHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA MAHIDHARAPUR, SATAMILE AND BACK, SUSHIL KUMAR BEHERA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD19F-1111.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that he has applied to ply his service on the route NTPC to Bhubaneswar via Angul. Though the applicant has applied Angul departure time at 9.01 hrs. which may be revised to 8.50hrs. to avoid any clash of timings and similarly, Bhubaneswar departure time be revised from 14.00hrs. instead of 13.15hrs.

Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Anjana Samal, owner of vehicle No.OD19F-1111 is represented by Advocate Sri S.Mishra. He stated that at Bhubaneswar, her service is departing at 13.25hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 13.15hrs. If applicant will modify his time to leave Bhubaneswar at 14.00hrs instead of 13.15hrs., she has no objection.
2. Sri T.K.Beura, owner of vehicle No.OR05X-9237 is represented by Advocate Shri S.Mishra. He stated that that there is clash of time from Angul to Bhubaneswar. His departure time at Angul is 9.10 hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to leave Angul at 9.01hrs.

Applicant stated that he wants to reduce halting time at Angul. Hence, the above objector stated that he has no objection if applicant's time at Angul is reduced.

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

152. ROUTE- PODADEHI TO KUNDUDEI VIA BANEI, KUCHINDA AND BACK, DHIRENDRA KU. NAYAK, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR15M-6443.

Applicant is present. Since the vehicle of applicant is a 17 years old vehicle, this should not be considered for inter region route. Hence, it is rejected.

153. ROUTE- DAMANJODI TO UMARKOTE VIA JEYPORE, BORIGUMMA AND BACK, SABITA BISOI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD10N-5895.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri P.K.Behera. He withdrew the application. Hence her application is rejected.

154. ROUTE- SIALIJODA TO JAJPUR ROAD VIA THAKURMUNDA, MAHULADIHA AND BACK, DILLIP KUMAR DAS, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR22D-3786.

Applicant is present.

There is one objection filed by Sri Janmejy Das, owner of vehicle No.OR19L-3316. He stated that, at Anandpur, the applicant has applied departure time at 8.50hrs. which is same to the objector's time.

Applicant stated that he may be allowed to leave Anandpur at 9.00hrs. instead of 8.50hrs. Both applicant and objector are agreed to it.

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

155. ROUTE- SARAGADA TO JAGATPUR VIA DHENKIKOTE, HARICHANDANPUR AND BACK, SWARNALATA DAS, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD11E9275-4898.

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

1. Sri D.N.Patra, owner of vehicle No.OR05AN-9275 is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that his service is departing Cuttack at 5.35hrs. and reaching Karanjia at 11.10hrs. and then leaving Karanjia at 13.00 hrs. and reaching Cuttack at 18.40hrs. But the applicant has proposed to leave Karanjia at 12.55hrs. to reach Jagatpur at 18.57 hrs. and then leave Jagatpur at 5.30hrs. to reach Karanjia at 11.18hrs. The objector stated that the applicant has mentioned such a route which is erroneous. The applicant has avoided some important stoppages. Besides, the objector has stated that since the route is under

rationalisation process, the application of the applicant may not be considered.

2. Sri Bibekananda Das, owner of vehicle No.OD11A-1110 is represented by Advocate Sri K.C.Das. He stated that the applicant has applied to ply his vehicle from Saragada to Jagatpur via Dhenkikote, Harichandanpur and back. Applicant has intentionally chosen this erroneous route to ply his vehicle which is covered a portion of rationalised route i.e. from Panikoili to Cuttack. This objector has also stated that there is clash of time in every stoppage like Duburi, Harichandanpur and Karanjia which is only five minutes gap. Besides, the objector stated that the route applied by the applicant is covering a portion of rationalised route from Cuttack to Panikoili and now the rationalisation timings is under process. Hence, application of the applicant may be rejected. If applicant case will be taken into consideration, then applicant may be given starting point from Cuttack instead of Jagatpur and also timing may be given after the service of this objector.

3. Sri P.C.Mahanta, owner of vehicle No.OR05AS-0565 stated that there is clash of time at Duburi, Brahmanipal, Harichandanpur, Dhenkikote, Karanjia and Jashipur. The departure time gap between his service and applicant's service at the above stoppages is 4 minutes, 10 minutes, 4 minutes, exact time, 5 minutes and 3 minutes respectively.

4. Sri P.L.Sahoo, owner of vehicle No.OD05Z-4099 stated that there is clash of time at Panikoili and Chandikhole. His departure time at Panikoili and Chandikhole is 16.40 and 17.20hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave from above two points at 17.16 and 18.03 respectively which is 36 minutes and 43 minutes after his service.

It is decided that, since the route applied by the applicant is under rationalization process, the application of the applicant shall not be considered. Hence it is rejected.

156. ROUTE- ERAM TO SORO VIA PADHUAN, ANANTAPUR AND BACK, DEBANDRA PRASAD ROUT, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR01K-7255.

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

There is one objection filed by Sri N.K.Mallick, owner of vehicle No.OR01F-5327 through Advocate Sri J.N.Mohanty. He stated that this objector is plying on the route Balasore to Kupari 2RT via Sergada, Khantapada, Bahanaga and Soro under the PP issued by



RTA, Balasore. He stated that the timing proposed by the applicant is clashing at Turigadia. His service is departing Turigadia at 16.40 whereas the applicant has proposed to leave at 16.36 just four minutes ahead of his service. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be given time after his service from Turigadia.

157. ROUTE- PARAJABADAPADA TO JANTAPAI VIA GOVINDAPALI, KHAIRAPUT AND BACK, B SUBRAMANYUM PATRO, OWNER OF VEHICLE AP35V0189.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri P.K.Behera. He withdrew the application. His application is rejected.

158. ROUTE- BELAGUNTHA TO BERHAMPUR VIA ASKA AND BACK, PRABHAKAR DALAI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD07P-9525.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.K.Rao. There is one objection filed by Sri R.K.Padhy, owner of vehicle No.OR07AA-4989. He stated that there is clash of time from Berhampur to Aska. His departure time from Berhampur is at 15.25 whereas the applicant has proposed to leave at 15.12 just thirteen minutes ahead of his service. The common corridor is from Berhampur to Balipadar which is 70 kms. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be given time after his service from Berhampur.

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

159. ROUTE- MOTABADI TO BERHAMPUR VIA BALIPADAR, ASKA AND BACK, SRINIBAS PANDA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD07AD-5121.

Applicant is present.

There is an objection filed by Sri S.N.Panigrahi, owner of vehicle No.OR07AA-5099 through Advocate Sri N.P.Panda. He has stated that at Berhampur, there is clash of time. His service is departing Berhampur at 9.36hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave at 9.27hrs. which is just nine minutes ahead of his service. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be given time to leave Berhampur at 9.15 instead of 9.27hrs.

This may be verified and considered subject to clash free time. If the departure time Berhampur is modified to 9.15, the timings of other stoppages may be modified subject to clash free time.

160. ROUTE- SENHAPALI TO BARPALI VIA MAHULPALLI, BHEDEN AND BACK, SATYANARAYAN MEHER, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD17G-0150.

Applicant is present. There is no objection.

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

161. ROUTE- BALASORE TO KARANJIA VIA UDALA, KAPTIPADA AND BACK, KABITA BEHERA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR22E2223.

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

1. Sri Sudhir Chandra Behera, owner of vehicle No.OD11A-1198 stated that in return trip at Karanjia, there is clash of time. His departure time at Karanjia is at 13.20 whereas the applicant has proposed to leave at 13.07 just thirteen minutes ahead of his service. Applicant may be given after his service.

2. Kubmani Choudhury, owner of vehicle No.OD11B-6622 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that at Balasore, his departure time is at 5.30hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave at 5.13hrs. which is just seventeen minutes ahead of his service. Hence, he requested that, applicant may be given after his service.

Applicant may be given departure time from Balasore at 5.00AM. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

162. ROUTE- ANTULIA TO RAIKAKHOL VIA BANKAPALAS, RANIAKATA AND BACK, SRIBATSA HOTA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR15R-4941.

Applicant is present. There is no objection.

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

163. ROUTE- SOLE TO IGH VIA TRAMRA, BIRIDA AND BACK, RASHMI RANJAN PATEL, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR16C-4892.

Applicant is present. There is one objection filed by Ankit Gupta, owner of vehicle No.OR14Q-1407. He stated that there is clash of time at Rourkela. His departure time at Rourkela is 14.15 whereas the applicant has applied to leave at 14.04hrs. which is just eleven minutes ahead of his service. He requested that the applicant may be given to depart Rorukela at 13.55. Both applicant and objector are agreed to it.

It is decided that applicant may submit a revised timing omitting stoppage at IGH. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

164. ROUTE- URUKULA TO PALA LAHARHA VIA NALCO COLONY, BALHAR AND BACK, JAY GOPAL SWAIN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR09P-6972.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri S.Mishra. Since the applied vehicle is a 25 seated, he withdrew the application.



165. ROUTE- BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO KARANJIA VIA JAJPUR ROAD, GHASIPURA AND BACK, MAHESH CHANDRA TRIPATHY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02Z-1710.

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

1. Sri S.K..Behera, owner of vehicle No.OD09B-3726 is represented by his son Sri T.P.Behera. He stated that his departure time at Cuttack is 6.20hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Cuttack at 6.20hrs. which is same time. Besides, the rationalization of timings on the route is under process. Hence, TP may not be considered till completion of rationalization process.

2. Sri Padmalochan Sahoo, owner of vehicle No.OD05Z-4099 stated that there is clash of time at Cuttack. His service is departing Cuttack at 6.25hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave at 6.20hrs. just five minutes ahead of his service. Besides, the rationalization of timings on the route is under process. Hence, TP may not be considered till completion of rationalization process.

It is decided that since the rationalization of timing is under process, the application may not be considered.

166. ROUTE- UADAYPUR TO BAISINGA VIA NAMPO, JALESWAR AND BACK, NASIMA BANO, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD01A-3898.

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

1. Sri S.K. Nanda, owner of vehicle No.OD01-9779 and OD01H-2569 is represented by Advocate Sri J.N.Mohanty. He stated that this objector is operating his above two vehicles on the strength of PP issued by RTA, Balasore on the route Kasafal to Balasore 1 RT and Balasore to Baliapal 1RT in respect of vehicle No.OD01-9779. His service is departing Balasore at 9.30hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at same time i.e. at 9.30hrs. and both the services of this objector and applicant will proceed in a same direction up to Haladiapada which is 50 kms. He requested that applicant may be given after his service.

As regards timing of his another service bearing No.OD01H-2569, he stated that his service is departing Balasore at 10.00hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave at 9.30hrs. and both the services of this objector and applicant will proceed in a same direction up to RATEI which is 50 kms. He requested that applicant may be given timing after his service.



Applicant stated that the route is on separate alignment. Objector's service is plying via Baliapal whereas he has applied via Langaleswar. The common corridor is only 14 kms. out of total 61 kms.

It was observed that the proposed route applied by the applicant is not a valid route. The applicant has added stoppage Baisinga to obtain the permit from STA. Hence, permit may not be considered.

167. ROUTE- TIKARAPARHA TO BURLA VIA RAIRAKHOL, CHARMAL AND BACK, PRADIP KUMAR SAHU, OWNER OF VEHICLE UP72AT-0934 / OD15Q-3211.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. He stated that he has reassigned the Odish Registration in respect of his vehicle and his Odisha Regn. No. is OD15Q-3211.

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

168. ROUTE- BASUDEVPUR TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA SAMSARPUR, CHATIA AND BACK, SAMBIT KU MOHANTY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR05AG-6355.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri S.Mishra.

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

169. ROUTE- CHUDAMANIPUR TO MORODA VIA GANDHI CHHAK, HALADIPADA AND BACK, CHHABIRANI BISWAL, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD01E-0248.

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

1. Sri S.K.Nanda, owner of vehicle No.OD01-9779 is represented by Advocate Sri J.N.Mohanty. He stated that there is clash of time at Balasore. His service in down trip is departing Balasore at 15.25hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave at 15.20hrs. just five minutes ahead of his service. Hence he requested that the applicant may be given time after his service. Applicant agreed to leave Balasore at 16.40hrs.

2. Trupti Pattnaik, owner of vehicle No.OR01L-2224 is represented by Advocate Shri D.B.Das and Associates. He stated that her departure time at Olamara is 5.30hrs. whereas the applicant

proposed to leave at 5.52hrs. He requested some more time gap may be given to the applicant at Olamara.

Applicant agreed to leave Olamara at 6.00hrs. instead of 5.52hrs. Accordingly, in return trip from Balasore, the timing may be modified to 16.40hrs.

It is decided that some more gap may be maintained between the service of this objector and applicant. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

170. ROUTE- BAUNSHAGARH TO BALAKATI VIA PATANA, MUGAMUNDA AND BACK, ASHOK KUMAR CHHUALSINGH, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02BH-0343.

Applicant is present. There is no objection.

TP may be considered from Baramunda, Bhubaneswar instead of Balakati subject to verification of clash free time.

171. ROUTE- BHADRAK TO UDALA VIA KURUNTA, GANDIBED AND BACK, GOUTAM SAHOO, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR19F3001.

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

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

172. ROUTE- KUAMARA TO BALARAMGADI VIA SAJANAGARH, NILAGIRI AND BACK, PRASANTA POTHAL, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD01AE-8812.

Applicant is present.

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

173. ROUTE- CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) TO GARABANDHA VIA DIGAPAHANDI, LUHAGUDI AND BACK, DEEPAK KUMAR SAMANTRAY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05L-6288.

Applicant is present.

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

174. ROUTE- DARINGBADI TO BERHAMPUR VIA DASMAILI, DHARKOTE AND BACK, SASMITA DALAI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD07AC-5551.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.K.Rao. Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Shri A.K.Panigrahi, owner of vehicle No.AP35T-4489 is represented by Advocate Sri N.P.Panda. He stated that his service is departing Berhampur at 13.50hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave at 13.48hrs. which is just two minutes ahead of his service. He stated that applicant may be given timing to leave Berhampur at 13.52 hrs. instead of 13.48hrs. Both applicant and objector are agreed to it.

2. Shri A.K.Panigrahi, owner of vehicle No.OR07K-2829 is represented by Advocate Sri N.P.Panda. He stated that his service is departing Berhampur at 13.40hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave at 13.48hrs. which is just eight minutes after his service. If the applicant is allowed to leave Berhampur at 13.52hrs.he has no objection.

Secondly, another vehicle No.OD07T-3553 of objector is plying under PP issued by RTA, Ganjam on the route Sorada to Berhampur via Aska Katu and back wherein his departure time from Berhampur is 9.10hrs whereas the applicant has applied to leave Berhampur at 9.07hrs which is only three minutes ahead of his service. He stated that if the applicant is allowed to leave Berhampur at 8.58 instead of 9.07hrs., he has no objection. Applicant also agreed to leave Berhampur at 8.58hrs.

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

175. ROUTE- RAJGANGPUR TO SAMBALPUR VIA HANDATUPA, BAGDIHI AND BACK, SUNIL KUMAR BEHERA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD15-1595.

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

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

176. ROUTE- MOHANA TO BERHAMPUR VIA BHISMAGIRI, DIGAPAHANDI AND BACK, JITENDRA BEHERA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR08H-1919.

Applicant is present. Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. There is one objection filed by Sri R.K.Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OR07H-0597. He stated that his departure time at BhisMagiri is 8.30hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave at 8.21hrs which is just nine minutes ahead of his service. Applicant may be given after his service.



2. Sri M.K.Panigrahi, owner of vehicle No.OR07J-2770 stated that at Berhampur, his service is departing at 17.20hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 17.18hrs. just two minutes ahead of his service. He stated that applicant may be given time after his service. Similarly, at Digapahandi, his departure time is at 19.05 whereas the applicant has proposed to leave at 18.55hrs. There is an online objection filed by this objector stating the same fact.

Applicant stated that earlier he had obtained a PP from RTA, Ganjam against the above vehicle No.OR08H-1919 which he has surrendered wherein the departure time at Berhampur was at 11.40. He has enclosed the copy of PP issued by the RTA, Ganjam. According to his previous PP, he has applied TP on the said departure time from Berhampur at 11.40 hrs.

Since the PP has been surrendered by the applicant, it may be considered for issue of TP subject to verification of clash free timings as well as whether he has surrendered the PP to the RTO, Ganjam.

177. **ROUTE-** KHARIAR TO KANTABANJI VIA BHALUMUNDA, BANGOMUNDA AND BACK, DEBA DUTTA JOSHI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR26A-5021.

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

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

178. **ROUTE-** CHANDAHANADI TO RAJKHARIAR VIA URMAL, SINAPALI AND BACK, HRUDANANDA BISHI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD26D-4527.

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

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

179. **ROUTE-** TIKARAPARHA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA BHAPUR, BIRAKISHOREPUR AND BACK, RANJAN KUMAR TARAI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05AU-1536.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.K.Rao. Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. There is an objection filed by Shri S.K.Garnaik, owner of vehicle No.OD19J-3154 through Advocate Sri S.Mishra. He stated that there is clash of time from Mahidharpur to Bhubaneswar which is 120kms. His arrival time at Mahidharpur is at 7.20hrs. and departure time is 7.25hrs. whereas the applicant applied to arrive Mahidharpur at 7.27hrs. and leave at 7.30hrs.

2. Sri M.K.Mishra, owner of vehicle No.OD05S-5377 is represented by Advocate Shri S.Mishra. He stated that there is clash of time at Bhubaneswar in down trip which is just two minutes ahead of his service. His service is departing Bhubaneswar at 13.07hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 13.05hrs. Both the vehicle will ply from Bhubaneswar to Birakishorepur/Athagarh which is 60 kms. distance. He requested that applicant may be allowed TP after his service.

It is decided that applicant may modify his departure time from Mahidharpur at 7.35hrs. and accordingly time gap should be maintained. Besides, the stoppage may be changed via Naduapada instead of Birakishorepur. According to the objector, the applicant has not maintained distance of kms. which should be maintained to ply as express service i.e. 25 kms. distance from one stoppage to another stoppage. Applicant may submit revised stoppages mentioning minimum gap of 25 kms. from one stoppages to another stoppage.

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

180. ROUTE- SOBHAPUT TO NABARANGPUR VIA SIMILIGUDA, KORAPUT AND BACK, UTTARA KABATA BHASKAR, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR02BY-2756.

Applicant was absent. (Later Sri P.K.Behera, Advocate appeared for the applicant). Following objectors have filed their objections:

1. Sri G.K.Mohan Rao, owner of vehicle No.OD10B-4509 is represented by Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. He stated that at his departure time at Similiguda is at 10.05 whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 10.05 which is exact time of this objector. Hence he requested that applicant may be given to depart Similiguda at 9.40hrs. The above objector has got another vehicle whose departure time at Similiguda is 9.35hrs.

2. Shiekh Kasim, owner of vehicle No.OD10J-0914 is represented by Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. He stated that there is clash of time at Jeypore. His departure time from Jeypore is at 15.35 whereas the applicant has proposed to leave at 15.33hrs. which is two minutes ahead of his service. He suggested that applicant may be given to depart Jeypore at 15.20hrs.

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

181. **ROUTE-** TUSURA TO BHAWANIPATANA VIA PALAM, TUNDALA AND BACK, SURYAKANTA DAS, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR08C-6212.

Applicant is present.

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

182. **ROUTE-** BASUDEVPUR TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA SAMSARPUR, CHATIA AND BACK, JYOTIKANT DASH, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR05AC-6355.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Shri S.Mishra.

There is an objection filed by Sri S.K.Mishra, claiming the representative of owner of vehicle No.OR-0367. He could not show any authorisation on behalf of the owner. Hence, his objection could not be taken into account for consideration.

Applicant stated that he has applied for a new TP on the route Bhubaneswar to Kamaladiah. He wants to apply for vacant slot No.10 (4.30) Bhubaneswar in up trip and vacant slot No.102 (11.59) Narasinghpur in the Cuttack/Bhubaneswar to Narasinghpur via Athgarh route. But unfortunately OPMS did not take the time and stoppage and showed clash of timing. Stoppage like Badamba and Athagarh may be added.

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

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

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

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

184. **ROUTE-** TUMBA TO NANDANKANAN VIA CHHATRAPUR, KESHPUR AND BACK, BALARAM PANIGRAHI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD07AD-9639.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that due to defect shown in OPMS, the halting time at Patia in Bhubaneswar City has been shown from 15.39hrs. to 19.25hrs. as a result reaching time at Tumba has become at 2.58hrs, which is neither feasible nor conducive for safe travelling of commuters which needs to be rationalized by reducing the halting time at Patia to two minutes only.

There is one objection filed by Sri Dinesh Panigrahi, owner of vehicle No.OD07AE-2424. He stated that there is clash of time at Berhampur. His departure time at Berhampur is at 7.00hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to leave at 6.46hrs. which is fourteen minutes ahead of his service. Applicant may be given departure time from Berhampur at 6.40hrs. Both are agreed to it that applicant shall be allowed to leave Berhampur at 6.40hrs.

This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time, deleting the stoppages like Patia and Nandankanan.

185. ROUTE- BARBIL TO IB THARMAL VIA BARKOTE, DEOGARH AND BACK, SATRUGHNA SINGH, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD09-3663.

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

1. Sri P.K.Panda, owner of vehicle No.OR09K-3384 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that his departure time at Keonjhar is at 9.50hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to leave at 9.48hrs. just two minutes ahead of his service. Applicant may be allowed to leave Keonjhar at 9.40hrs.

2. Sri K.K.Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OR19M-5396 is represented by Advocate Sri S.Mishra. He stated that the departure time of his vehicle at Keonjhar is 12.50hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave at 12.37hrs. which is thirteen minutes ahead of his service. According to him both the vehicle reaches Angul at same time. Hence he requested that applicant may be given time after his service. Alternatively, he may be allowed to depart Keonjhar at 12.37hrs. and applicant may be given to leave at 12.50hrs. There is an online objection given by this owner stating the same objection.

This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time or timing may be exchanged between objector and applicant from Keonjhar point.

186. ROUTE- KARAMALA TO CDA SECTOR-9 VIA KHURDHA, BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) AND BACK, JAJATI KESHARI DASH, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR05Y-2215.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. There is no objection. Applicant may be considered for TP omitting stoppages like Master Canteen and CDA Sector-9. Applicant may delete the above two points i.e. Master Canteen and CDA Sector-9.

187. **ROUTE-** MUNIGUDA TO BALIGUDA VIA RADIGUMA, KOTAGADA AND BACK, DEEPAK KUMAR MAHARANA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR12B-1129.

Applicant is present. There is an objection filed by Smt. K.P.Dakua, owner of vehicle No.OR12B-1425 through Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that at Muniguda, there is clash of time. His departure time at Muniguda is 6.30hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to leave at 6.05hrs. which is twenty five minutes ahead of his service. The proposed time of applicant in starting point is twenty five minutes ahead of the service of this objector, but reaches in last point i.e. Baliguda just five minutes prior to the service of this objector. Hence this objector stated that the time gap may be maintained rationally.

Similarly, in down trip the applicant has applied to depart Baliguda at 10.55hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave at 10.40hrs. fifteen minutes ahead of his service. Hence he requested that the applicant may be allowed to operate his vehicle after the service of this objector. Applicant stated that the vehicle of the objector is taking 110 minutes time from Baliguda to Kotagada which is only 55kms. It is observed that timing of objector is pretty higher side which may be revised. T.P. may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

188. **ROUTE-** DHENKANAL TO KAMAKHYANAGAR VIA PANDUA AND BACK, MANI ROUT, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR14T-3252.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.K.Rao. This may be rejected as the applied route is coming under the jurisdiction of one region i.e. Dhenkanal. But the applicant has applied to obtain permit from STA by touching stoppage like Dorada which comes under Athagarh Sub-Division. Applicant may apply in RTA, Dhenkanal leaving the portion of Dorada.

189. **ROUTE-** CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) TO DASAMANTHAPUR VIA DIGAPAHANDI, TAPTAPANI AND BACK, MADHUSMITA SAHOO, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD15G-6688.

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

190. **ROUTE-** RAYAGADA TO NARAYANPATNA VIA KUMBHARIPUT, BANDHUGAON AND BACK, K. K. V. LAXMAN RAO, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR18-6489.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. Since the vehicle of the applicant is a 2002 model vehicle, it should not be considered for inter region route.

191. ROUTE- GUHALADANGIRI TO REMULI VIA BHANJKIA, RARUAN AND BACK, CHANDAN KUMAR PRADHAN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD09R-2325.

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

192. ROUTE- ANGUL TO TIKILIPARA VIA SAMAL BARKOTE AND BACK, KISHOR CHANDRA SAMAL, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD15B-2121.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. He stated that the applicant has applied to ply as alter service of OD15P-5467. There is no objection. This may be considered as alter service of OD15P-5467 and also verification of clash free time.

193. ROUTE- DHARMAGARH TO KANTABANJI VIA KIRKITA, DUAJHAR AND BACK, BHUMISUTA BHOI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD26D-5716.

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

194. ROUTE- SINGHASINI TO PURI MUNICIPALTY BUS STAND VIA BEGUNIAPADA, SUMANDALA AND BACK, SHESADEV MISHRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD13M-9898.

Applicant is present. There is an objection filed by Sri P.K.Sahoo, owner of vehicle No.OR05AA-5099 through Advocate Sri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that there is clash of time from Polasara to Rameswar. His departure time at Polasara is 5.20hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to leave Polasara at 5.10hrs. which is just ten minutes ahead of his service. Hence objector suggested that the applicant may be given TP ten minutes after his service or applicant may be allowed to leave Polasara at 5.05hrs. and Singhasini at 4.10hrs. Both objector and applicant are agreed to it.

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

195. ROUTE- BOLANGIR TO PHULABANI VIA LUISINGI, BALANDAPADA AND BACK, BIJU BAGARTTI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR19L-1752.

Applicant is present. There is an objection filed by Sri S.K.Pradhan, owner of vehicle No.OR02AJ-2444 through Advocate K.Mohammad. He stated that there is clash of time at Kantamal. His service is departing Kantamal at 8.30hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart Kantamal at 7.40hrs. which is fifty minutes ahead of his service. The objector stated that since the applicant has

proposed to depart Kantamal 50 minutes ahead of his service, but gradually the gap is reducing to 20 minutes from Gochhapada to Phulbani in up trip. The gap should be maintained proportionately. Both services are ordinary.

This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time and proportionate time gap may be maintained.

196. ROUTE- CHILIKHAMA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA ODAGAON, GODIPADA AND BACK, SANTOSH KU PALTASINGH, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02AE-8906.

Applicant is present. Following vehicles owners have given their objections.

1. A.K.Sundaray, owner of vehicle No.OD02AH-1595 and OD02AH-7195 is represented by Advocate Sri K.C.Das. He stated that timing of his first vehicle i.e. OD02AH-1595 is clashing at Bhubaneswar point. His dep. Time from Bhubaneswar is 12.10hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to leave at 11.55hrs. which is just fifteen minutes ahead of his service. Hence, he has suggested that the applicant may be given TP after his service. Secondly, in respect of his another vehicle No.OD02AH-7195, there is clash of time at Godipada. His vehicle is departing Godipada at 8.00hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to leave at 7.55hrs. which is just five minutes ahead of his service. The common corridor is from Godipada to Bhubaneswar which is 90 kms. Hence, he has requested that the applicant may be given timing after his service.
2. Nalini Prava Mishra, owner of vehicle No.OD02J-5787 is represented by authorized representative Sri B.K.Mishra. He stated that though the applicant has proposed to depart Jagannath Prasad 33 minutes after his service, but will reach Odagaon 5 minutes before arrival of his service. Hence, he has requested that the applicant may be given timing after his service. Besides, the objector stated that the actual distance from Kamasaragada to Odagaon is 26kms. whereas the applicant has mentioned the distance as 21kms. which may be revised.

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

197. ROUTE- NABARANGPUR TO DHARMAGARH VIA PAPADAHANDI, AMPANI AND BACK, BRAJAMOHAN SHARMA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD24A-9319.

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

198. ROUTE- REVANA PALASHPAL TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA DUBURI, BRAHMANI BRIDGE AND BACK, JAMUDA SUPPLIERS, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD04-8157.

Applicant is absent. Following vehicle owners have given their objections.

1. Sri N.K.Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OD09N-3721 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.K.Rao. He stated that there is clash of time at Bramhanipal. His departure time at Brahmanipal is 6.46hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 6.30hrs. which is sixteen minutes ahead of his service. Similarly, Since, the applicant proposed to depart sixteen minutes ahead of his service, but reaches Cuttack at 9.21hrs. whereas the objector's vehicle reaches at 9.29hrs. which is eight minutes gap. Hence, he has requested that the applicant may be given time after his service.
2. Sri Sambit Rout, owner of vehicle No.OR04C-7591 stated that his vehicle is departing Cuttack at 15.10hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 15.00hrs. which is ten minutes ahead of his service. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be given timing after his service.
3. Pranati Nayak, owner of vehicle No.OR04H-8544 is represented by her authorized person Sri Bhabatosh Nayak. He stated that in the down trip at Cuttack, there is clash of timing. His service is departing Cuttack at 14.45hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Cuttack at 15.00hrs. which is only fifteen minutes after his service. At Chandikhole, the timing given by the applicant is jumping time. Vehicle of this objector is plying as ordinary service, whereas the applicant has applied to ply as express service.
4. Sri B.R.Nayak, owner of vehicle No.OR04L-0085 stated that there is clash of time at Duburi point. His service is departing Duburi at 7.20hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart Duburi at 7.09hrs. which is only eleven minutes ahead of his service. He has requested that the applicant may be given time after his service.
5. Sri K.C.Jena, owner of vehicle No.OD04-8157 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.K. Rao. He stated that the timing applied by the applicant is up trip is directly clashing with the timings of his service from Duburi to Bhubaneswar. Hence, the objector has requested that the applicant may be given timing 20 minutes after his service.

This should not be considered as the applicant has not adopted the norms of express service. Hence, this may be rejected.

199. **ROUTE-** KULASARA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA PUBUSAHI, KHURDA NEW BUSTAND AND BACK, BIJAY KUMAR MOHAPTRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05U-6581.

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

200. **ROUTE-** PURUNAPANI TO ROURKELA VIA KUARMUNDA, VEDVYAS AND BACK, JASINTA BARLA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR23D-7681.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that in between Kuarmunda and Akurpali, Kacharu G.P. may be added. There is no objection. This may be verified whether the route applied by the applicant is coming under one region or more than one region before considering the grant of TP. If it is more than one region, then it may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.


11.5.2020
Transport Commissioner-Cum-Chairman,
STA, Odisha, Cuttack.

Final