

**PROCEEDING OF THE 301st VIRTUAL MEETING OF STA, ODISHA,
CUTTACK HELD ON 19.07.2023.**

MEMBERS PRESENT:-

- | | | | |
|---|-----|------|----------|
| 1- Shri Amitabh Thakur, IPS
Transport Commissioner, Odisha | ... | ... | Chairman |
| 2- Shri Brajabandhu Bhol, OAS (SS)
Secretary, STA | ... | ... | Member |
| 3- Shri Somit Mitra | ... | ... | Member |
| 4- Shri Kishore Chandra Das,
Joint Secretary to Govt., C & T (T) Dept. | ... | | Member |

At the outset, the Chairman, STA welcomed all the members to the 301st virtual meeting of STA.

Proceedings of the 300th virtual meeting of State Transport Authority held on 24.03.2023 circulated among all the members vide this office Memo No.6063/TC dated 24.04.2023 is confirmed as no objections have been received.

Action taken by Chairman, STA, Secretary, STA and Joint Secretary, STA as per delegation of powers by STA for the period from 24.03.2023 to 18.07.2023 are approved.

POLICY DECISION :-

- 1.(A) Grant of temporary permit to a stage carriage more than 15 years and less than 20 years of age.**

The STA in its 299th meeting held on 20.01.2023 resolved that:-

"Considering safety and comfort of passengers travelling in buses, the bus owners were asked to produce latest model / new vehicles in place of buses which are more than 15 years old for the safety of commuting public. However, the bus owners have stated that they are willing to provide new buses against the old stage carriages which are more than 15 years old, but they want some time to place new / later model vehicles.


24.8.

The STA after due deliberation and keeping in view safety and comfort of commuting public resolved that **one temporary permit for four months** will be considered by Chairman, STA in respect of stage carriages more than 15 years and less than 20 years old from the month/year of manufacture."

In a reported decision dated 17.02.2022 of Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal Nos.1453-1454 of 2022 Regional Transport Authority & anr. Versus Shaju etc, Hon'ble Court referred to following judgments of Hon'ble Supreme Court which are quoted below.

"xx xx xx

19.2 The Division Bench judgment of the High Court of Madhya Pradesh was approved by this Court in the case of *Subhash Chandra and Ors. v. State of U.P. and Ors.* (1980) 2 SCC 324 wherein Justice Krishna Iyer in his inimitable expression observed as under:

"3.... The State must remember that it has responsibilities not merely to minibus owners, but also to avoid the daily tragedies on the Indian highways under the little wheels of these whirling carriages. Section 51(2) Motor vehicles act, 1939, is geared to public safety, not private profits and cast a solemn duty not to be deterred by any pressure except the pressure of social justice to Indian lives moving in buses, walking on roads or even standing on margins. If the top killer – road accident – is to be awarded death sentence, Section 51 and like provisions must receive severe enforcement. In this spirit – although backtracking from 4-year-old vehicles to 7-year-old models – the State imposed condition 18. This was challenged artfully but unsuccessfully before the High Court and is attacked before us as ultra-vires Section 51(2) of the Act. We will examine briefly the submissions to reach the conclusion that mere lexical legalism cannot sterilize the sensible humanism writ large on Section 51(2)(c). It is not ultra vires Indian law every condition to save life and limb is intra vires such salvation re-provision. This perspective of social justice simplifies the problem and upholds the High Court.

4.... The short question is whether the prescription that the bus shall be at least a 7-year-old model one is relevant to the condition of the vehicle and its passenger's comparative safety and comfort on our chaotic highways. Obviously, it is. The older the model, the less the chances of the latest safety measures being built into the vehicle. Every new model incorporates new devices to reduce danger and promote comfort. Every new model assures its age to be young, fresh and strong, less likely to suffer sudden failures and breakages, less susceptible to wear and tear and mental fatigue leading to unexpected collapse... We have no hesitation to hold, from the point of view of human rights of road users, that the condition regarding model of the permitted bus is within the jurisdiction and not to prescribe such safety clauses is abdication of statutory duty.

5.We are clear that a later model is a better safeguard and, more relevantly to the point, the year of the make and the particulars of the model or part of the description."

This judgment is followed by Hon'ble Supreme Court in a subsequent decision in the case *S.K. Bhatia and Ors.v. State of U.P and Ors.* (1983) 4 SCC 194.

The bus owners have stated that they are willing to provide new buses against the old stage carriages which are more than 15 years old, but they want some time to place new / later model vehicles.

After due deliberation and keeping in view of law laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court (Supra), safety and comfort of commuting public and provision contained under Section 72 (2) of M.V. Act, 1988, it is resolved that one temporary permit for 119 days (second time) will be considered by Chairman, STA or Chairman, RTA, as the case may be, in any route length of which does not exceed 200 kms (one way) in respect of stage carriages more than 15 years and less than 20 years old from the month/year of manufacture. No permanent stage carriage / contract carriage permit shall be issued to vehicles which are more than 15 years old. No permit (permanent and temporary permit) shall be granted to vehicles which is more than 20 years old by the STA and RTA. All the RTAs shall adhere to above decision while granting permanent / temporary stage / contract carriage permits in their respective regions.

248

(B) GRANT OF PERMITS TO OTHER STATE STAGE CARRIAGES/
CONTRACT CARRIAGES :-

The Hon'ble High Court while disposing of OJC No.17728, OJC No.17729, OJC No.15848, OJC No.15847, OJC No.15674, OJC No.15961, OJC No.17658 and OJC No.18105 of 1998 on 26.07.2007 passed the following order:

"xx xx xx. However, the said affidavit discloses a rather unhappy picture so far as plying of the buses is concerned. It is a growing concern of everybody about maintenance of environmental purity in the matter of plying of different buses. Apart from maintaining environment purity, safety of the passengers is also a prime concern and frequent accidents take place in view of the fact that the buses which are not roadworthy are being allowed to ply on the road on the basis of not complying with the strict enforcement of various Rules and Regulations relating to grant of permit. xx xx xx."

Recently accident took place on 26th June, 2023 at Digapahandi, Ganjam while a private bus No.OR-10A-6875 (Model – 3/1998) which is more than 25 years old collided with OSRTC bus No.OD-02BV-1938 and the private bus overturned resulting death of eleven passengers and nine passengers sustained grievous injuries who were travelling in the private bus.

Considering order passed by Hon'ble High Court (supra) and recent accident took place on 26.06.2023 at Digapahandi, after deliberation, keeping in view the safety, comfort, convenience of travelling public, it is decided that stage / contract carriages registered in other States which are more than 10 years old from the month and year of manufacture shall not be granted any permit in the State of Odisha. All the Regional Transport Officers are instructed

- (i) not to make any change of address
- (ii) not to allow transfer of ownership
- (iii) not to accept tax

in respect of other State stage / contract carriage vehicles which are more than 10 years old henceforth.



(C) **EVALUATION AND MARKING TO VOLVO BUSES :-**

The STA in its 287th meeting held on 22.01.2019 resolved that:-

“3.7. **Assignment of marks to Volvo / Scania / Benz etc buses** :Extra 25 marks will be given to Volvo / Scania / Benz etc and other similar quality Stage carriages equipped with adequate safety features while adjudging comparative merit of applicants for grant of stage carriage permit over and above of the marks given to Air Conditioned Deluxe, Air Conditioned Deluxe Sleeper and Fully built Air Conditioned Sleeper stage carriages.”

Considering safety, convenience and comfort of travelling public and to eliminate stage carriages which are more than 05 years old while adjudging comparative merits while granting stage carriage permit and in modification of above decision, it is resolved that :-

- (a) Extra 25 marks will be awarded for Volvo/ Scania/ Benz etc and other similar quality Stage carriages equipped with adequate safety features while adjudging comparative merit of applicants for grant of stage carriage permit over and above of the marks given to Air Conditioned Deluxe, Air Conditioned Deluxe Sleeper and Fully built Air Conditioned Sleeper stage carriages where such chassis is manufactured within one year from the date of application.
- (b) Where such chassis was manufactured more than one year and within two years from the date of application extra 20 marks will be awarded.
- (c) Where such chassis was manufactured more than two years and within three years from the date of application extra 15 marks will be awarded.
- (d) Where such chassis was manufactured more than three years and within four years from the date of application extra 10 marks will be awarded.
- (e) Where such chassis was manufactured more than four years and within five years from the date of application extra 05 marks will be awarded.

248

- (f) No extra mark will be awarded to Volvo/ Scania/ Benz etc and other similar quality Stage carriages where chassis was manufactured more than five years from the date of application.

(D) SURRENDER OF PERMIT :-

The STA in its 296th meeting held on 07.04.2022 resolved that :-

"In the earlier meeting it was decided by STA that stage carriage permit holder shall not be allowed to change the route within a period of one year taking together the period of validity of temporary permit and permanent permit. Such decision was taken considering the fact that frequent surrender of permit will adversely affect the interest of travelling public.

It is noticed that after obtaining temporary stage carriage permit or permanent permit by the vehicle owner, the permit holder is surrendering the temporary or permanent permit on some pretext or other. After surrender of permit, the vehicle owner is making application for grant of temporary permit on a new route leaving the route abandoned for which permit was issued to him to provide service to the commuting public. It is a fact that while making application for grant of temporary stage carriage permit, the bus operator himself selects the route of his choice and accordingly temporary permit was issued to him following due procedure. In case the permit holder is allowed to change the route frequently, the travelling public will be deprived of getting bus service from that particular route and such practice of surrendering the permit should be discontinued.

After due deliberation, it was resolved that in cases where the permit holder is surrendering the stage carriage permit, whether temporary or permanent, within a period of one year, no permit shall be granted to the owner on any route in respect of said vehicle for a period of six months from the date of surrender of permit, except in case where the vehicle owner decided to transfer ownership of said vehicle to other than family members. Change of route shall not be allowed where the permit holder did not obtain permanent permit after expiry of temporary permit."



After due deliberation and partial modification of aforesaid decision, it is resolved that where the holder of a permanent / temporary permit surrendered the permit, said permit shall be cancelled and the route will be notified in website inviting applications from the deserving bus operators for grant of permit in the interest of travelling public. The permit holder who surrendered the permit shall not be allowed to apply for any new stage / contract carriage permit in STA / RTA for a period of one year from the date of surrender.

(E) **NOT MAKING APPLICATION FOR GRANT OF PERMANENT STAGE CARRIAGE PERMIT :-**

Where the holder of temporary stage carriage permit not applied for grant of permanent permit in any route during validity of temporary permit, the route shall be notified after expiry of temporary permit.

(F) **RENEWAL OF PERMANENT STAGE CARRIAGE PERMIT :-**

Where the holder of permanent stage carriage permit did not apply for renewal of permit before 15 days of its expiry or within the validity of permit stating reason of delay, the route shall be notified in the website on the next day of expiry of permanent permit inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the interest of travelling public.

(G) **ALLOTMENT OF RUNNING TIME :-** The STA in its 282nd meeting held on 21.07.2016 resolved that :-

"a) FIXATION OF SPEED LIMIT OF STAGE CARRIAGES.

Since long one and half minute running time is being allotted to cover distance of one kilometre for ordinary stage carriage service and one and half minutes to express stage carriage service.

The MORTH, Government of India issued notification vide S.O. No.1997 (E) dated 05.08.2014 in which Speed Limit of passenger carrying vehicles has been fixed as 80 kilometres per hour.



After due deliberation it was resolved that two minutes running time will be allotted to Ordinary Service and one and half minutes running time will be allotted to Express / Deluxe Service per kilometre while allotting timing to stage carriages."

The STA in its 289th meeting held on 05.11.2019 resolved that :-

"1.7 Allotment of timing to stage carriages plying on long distance interstate routes:-Most of the stage carriages are operating on long distance interstate routes during night hours. As per earlier decision taken by STA one and half minutes running time allotted to express / deluxe stage carriages per kilometer. Keeping in view the interest of travelling public on long distance interstate route during night hours, it was decided to allot running time one minute per kilometer subject to speed limit notified by respective District Magistrates enroute."

After due deliberation STA resolved that Volvo/ Scania/ Benz etc and other similar quality Stage carriages equipped with adequate safety features and plying on long distance route will be allotted running time one minute per kilometer subject to speed limit notified by respective District Magistrates enroute.

1. INTER-STATE ROUTES (SINGLE APPLICATIONS)

ITEM NO.1.1:- SOHELA TO RAIPUR VIA.BANJARINAKA & BACK

Pursuant to the advertisement published in website and daily Odia newspaper "The Samaj" and English Newspaper "The Times of India" on 04.07.2023 inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the interstate route **Sohela to Raipur via. Banjarinaka & back. Sri Arpan Kumar Sahoo**, owner of vehicle No.OD02C-1897 has filed application for grant of permanent permit in the aforesaid route.

Applicant **Sri Arpan Kumar Sahoo**, owner of vehicle No.OD02C-1897 was represented by advocate Sri J.N. Mohanty. He has submitted the Bank Guarantee and self-declaration in Annexure-A and B.

As per Vahan data no e-challan has been drawn under section 192 (A) of M.V Act 1988 against above stage carriage owned by the applicant within one year prior to date of consideration of present application.

After due deliberation, it was decided to grant permanent stage carriage permit to **Sri Arpan Kumar Sahoo**, owner of vehicle No.**OD02C-1897** in the Interstate route **Sohela to Raipur via. Banjarinaka & back** as Deluxe service, to perform single trip daily, subject to verification of original documents submitted by him. The permit is valid subject to grant of countersignature by STA, Chhatisgarh. The permit holder will get the permit countersigned within 90 days failing which the permit is liable to be cancelled. The grantee shall lift the permit within a period of 30 days from the date of communication of grant order, failing which the grant order shall deem to be revoked. Before issue of permit, tax payment position, audit and e-challan clearance should be obtained and it should be ensured that the vehicle was not off-road on the date of application and on the date of consideration.

**ITEM NO.1.2:- JHARSUGUDA TO JASHPURNAGAR VIA.SUNDERGARH,
TELIJORE, TAPARIA, KUNKURI & BACK**

Pursuant to the advertisement published in website and daily Odia newspaper "The Samaj" and English Newspaper "The Times of India" on **04.07.2023** inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the interstate route **Jharsuguda to Jashpurnagar via. Sundergarh, Telijore, Taparia, Kunkuri & back**. **Sri Deepak Sahu**, owner of vehicle No.**OD23E-1681** has filed application for grant of permanent permit in the aforesaid route.

Applicant, **Sri Deepak Sahu**, owner of vehicle No.**OD23E-1681** was represented by advocate **Sri J.N. Mohanty**. He has submitted the Solvency Certificate and self-declaration in Annexure-A and B.

As per Vahan data no e-challan has been drawn under section 192 (A) of M.V Act 1988 against above stage carriage owned by the applicant within one year prior to date of consideration of present application.

After due deliberation, it was decided to grant permanent stage carriage permit to **Sri Deepak Sahu**, owner of vehicle No.**OD23E-1681** in the Interstate route **Jharsuguda to Jashpurnagar via. Sundergarh, Telijore, Taparia, Kunkuri & back** to perform two trips daily as Ordinary Service on vacant timing slot, subject to verification of original documents submitted by him. The permit is valid subject to grant of countersignature by STA, Chhatisgarh. The permit holder will get the permit



countersigned within 90 days failing which the permit is liable to be cancelled. The grantee shall lift the permit within a period of 30 days from the date of communication of grant order, failing which the grant order shall deem to be revoked. Before issue of permit, tax payment position, audit and e-challan clearance should be obtained and it should be ensured that the vehicle was not off-road on the date of application and on the date of consideration.

ITEM NO.1.3:- BARIPADA TO CHAKULIA VIA.JAMSOLA & BACK.

Pursuant to the advertisement published in website and daily Odia newspaper "The Samaj" and English Newspaper "The Times of India" on **04.07.2023** inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the interstate route **Baripada to Chakulia via.Jamsola & back. Sri Prasanta Barik**, owner of vehicle No.**OD11L-9159** has filed application for grant of permanent permit in the aforesaid route.

Applicant, **Sri Prasanta Barik**, owner of vehicle No.**OD11L-9159** was represented by advocate Sri A.K. Behera. He has submitted the Bank Guarantee and self-declaration in Annexure-A and B.

As per Vahan data no e-challan has been drawn under section 192 (A) of M.V Act 1988 against above stage carriage owned by the applicant within one year prior to date of consideration of present application.

On verification of application filed by **Sri Prasanta Barik** it is found that, he has submitted Annexure-A and B disclosing that he is the owner of vehicle OD11L-9159 and suppressing the fact that he owns another one vehicle i.e. OD11F-9503.

The STA after due deliberation decided to reject the application filed by **Sri Prasanta Barik**, owner of vehicle No.**OD11L-9159** for suppression of fact and submitting wrong information in Annexure-A and B and to notify the route in the website inviting applications for grant of permanent permit in the interest of commuting public.

A handwritten signature in a circle, followed by a horizontal line and the date "24.8".

ITEM NO.1.4:- BARIPADA TO MEDINAPUR VIA.JAMSOLA, BAHARGORA, DARISOLA, KHARAGPUR & BACK.

Pursuant to the advertisement published in website and daily Odia newspaper "The Samaj" and English Newspaper "The Times of India" on 04.07.2023 inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the interstate route Baripada to Medinapur via. Jamsola, Bahargora, Darisola, Kharagpur & back. Smt. Bishnupriya Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OD11Z-7120 has filed application for grant of permanent permit in the aforesaid route.

Applicant, Smt. Bishnupriya Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OD11Z-7120 was represented by advocate Sri A.K. Behera. She has submitted self-declaration in Annexure-A and B.

Advocate for the applicant stated that, she wants to withdraw her application. The application is rejected as withdrawn.

The STA after due deliberation decided to notify the route in website inviting applications for grant of permanent permit in the interest of commuting public.

ITEM NO.1.5:- KAPTIPADA TO RANCHI VIA.JAMSOLA & BACK.

Pursuant to the advertisement published in website and daily Odia newspaper "The Samaj" and English Newspaper "The Times of India" on 04.07.2023 inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the interstate route Kaptipada to Ranchi via.Jamsola & back. Smt. Bishnupriya Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OD11Z-7120 has filed application for grant of permanent permit in the aforesaid route.

Applicant, Smt. Bishnupriya Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OD11Z-7120 was represented by advocate Sri A.K. Behera. She has submitted the Bank Guarantee and self-declaration in Annexure-A and B.

As per Vahan data no e-challan has been drawn under section 192 (A) of M.V Act 1988 against above stage carriage owned by the applicant within one year prior to date of consideration of present application.

After due deliberation, it was decided to grant permanent stage carriage permit to Smt. Bishnupriya Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OD11Z-7120 in the Interstate route Kaptipada to Ranchi via. Jamsola & back as Express service, subject to



verification of original documents submitted by her. The permit is valid subject to grant of countersignature by STA, Jharkhand. The permit holder will get the permit countersigned within 90 days failing which the permit is liable to be cancelled. The grantee shall lift the permit within a period of 30 days from the date of communication of grant order, failing which the grant order shall deem to be revoked. Before issue of permit, tax payment position, audit and e-challan clearance should be obtained and it should be ensured that the vehicle was not off-road on the date of application and on the date of consideration.

ITEM NO.1.6:- BARIPADA TO GUMLA VIA.RAIRANGPUR, TIRING, TATA, RANCHI, SISAI & BACK.

Pursuant to the advertisement published in website and daily Odia newspaper "The Samaj" and English Newspaper "The Times of India" on **04.07.2023** inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the interstate route **Baripada to Gumla via.Rairangpur, Tiring, Tata, Ranchi, Sisai & back.** Sri M/s **Arnav Travels, Prop- Umashankar Pradhan**, owner of vehicle No.**OD11S-9646** has filed application for grant of permanent permit in the aforesaid route.

Applicant, **Sri M/s Arnav Travels, Prop- Umashankar Pradhan**, owner of vehicle No.**OD11S-9646** was represented by advocate Sri S. Mishra. He has submitted the Bank Guarantee and self-declaration in Annexure-A and B.

As per Vahan data no e-challan has been drawn under section 192 (A) of M.V Act 1988 against above stage carriage owned by the applicant within one year prior to date of consideration of present application.

Advocate Sri H.P. Mohanty has filed an objection on behalf of Sri Arun Kumar Agrawal, owner of vehicle No.**OR11J-3163** and **OD11E-6021**. He stated that, the proprietor, Sri Umashankar Pradhan of Arnav Travels is a permanent resident of Jharkhand State and has obtained permanent permit from STA, Jharkhand in respect of his vehicle No.**JH05CL-5953** on the Intra-district route Kumardungi to Tata & back. He has further stated that, the vehicle **OD11S-9646** has been registered in Mayurbhanj giving a temporary address without any documentary evidence of residence and the proposed timings will clash with the timings of the vehicles of objector as mentioned above.

The objection raised by the advocate for objector regarding residence of applicant is required to be examined by the office. Applicant will produce the required documents to establish that he is a permanent resident of Odisha. It is decided that if the applicant does not produce residence proof from the competent revenue authority, the application shall be rejected and in case he produces a valid residence certificate it shall be considered.

ITEM NO.1.7:- BONEIGARH TO RANCHI VIA.ROURKELA, BIRAMITRAPUR & BACK.

Pursuant to the advertisement published in website and daily Odia newspaper "The Samaj" and English Newspaper "The Times of India" on **04.07.2023** inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the interstate route **Boneigarh to Ranchi via. Rourkela, Biramitrapur & back. M/s Arnav Travels, Prop-Umashankar Pradhan, owner of vehicle No.OD11S-9646** has filed application for grant of permanent permit in the aforesaid route.

Applicant, **M/s Arnav Travels, Prop.-Umashankar Pradhan**, owner of vehicle **No.OD11S-9646** was represented by advocate Sri S. Mishra. He has submitted the self-declaration in Annexure-A and B.

Advocate for the applicant stated that, he wants to withdraw his application. The application is rejected as withdrawn.

The STA after due deliberation decided to notify the route in website inviting applications for grant of permanent permit in the interest of commuting public.

ITEM NO.1.8:- BARIPADA TO MUSABANI VIA.JAMSOLA & BACK.

Pursuant to the advertisement published in website and daily Odia newspaper "The Samaj" and English Newspaper "The Times of India" on **04.07.2023** inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the interstate route **Baripada to Musabani via.Jamsola & back. Sri Prasanta Barik, owner of vehicle No.OD11L-9159** has filed application for grant of permanent permit in the aforesaid route.



Applicant, **Sri Prasanta Barik**, owner of vehicle No.**OD11L-9159** was represented by advocate Sri A.K. Behera. He has submitted the self-declaration in Annexure-A and B.

Advocate for the applicant stated that, he wants to withdraw his application. The application is rejected as withdrawn.

The STA after due deliberation decided to notify the route in website inviting applications for grant of permanent permit in the interest of commuting public.

ITEM NO.1.9:- PATRAPUR TO BERHAMPUR VIA.ICHHAPUR & BACK.

Pursuant to the advertisement published in website and daily Odia newspaper "The Samaj" and English Newspaper "The Times of India" on **04.07.2023** inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the interstate route **Patrapur to Berhampur via. Ichhapur & back. Sri Tileswar Nayak**, owner of vehicle No.**OD18-7476** has filed application for grant of permanent permit in the aforesaid route.

Applicant, **Sri Tileswar Nayak**, owner of vehicle No.**OD18-7476** was represented by advocate Sri M.B.K. Rao. He has submitted the self-declaration in Annexure-A and B. Applicant has not submitted the Solvency Certificate / Bank Guarantee.

On verification of application filed by **Sri Tileswar Nayak** it is found that, he has submitted Annexure-A and B disclosing that he is the owner of vehicle OD18-7476 and OD12-6010, suppressing the fact that he owns another one vehicle i.e. OD12E-1197.

Financial Stability of the applicant cannot be adjudged in absence of Solvency Certificate/Bank Guarantee as required under Section 71 (3) (d) (i) of M.V Act 1988.

The STA after due deliberation decided to reject the application filed by **Sri Tileswar Nayak** for non-submission of Solvency Certificate/Bank Guarantee and suppression of fact and to notify the route in website inviting applications for grant of permanent permit in the interest of commuting public.

ITEM NO.1.10:- UMERKOTE TO JAGDALPUR VIA.CHANDILI & BACK.

Pursuant to the advertisement published in website and daily Odia newspaper "The Samaj" and English Newspaper "The Times of India" on 04.07.2023 inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the interstate route Umerkote to Jagdalpur via.Chandili & back. Sri Maheswar Bisoi, owner of vehicle No.OD10U-5580 has filed application for grant of permanent permit in the aforesaid route.

Soumyadeep Bisoi son of applicant, Sri Maheswar Bisoi, owner of vehicle No.OD10U-5580 is present. He has submitted the Bank Guarantee and self-declaration in Annexure-A and B.

On verification of application filed by Sri Maheswar Bisoi it is found that, he has submitted Annexure-A and B disclosing that he is the owner of vehicle OD10W-2205 and OD10U-5580, suppressing the fact, that he owns other vehicles i.e. AP35T-8595, OD24G-9693, OR10B-2205, OD10F-5895, OD24B-9585 and OR05B-9099.

Objection has been received from the learned advocate on behalf of Sri Surya Narayan Patra, owner of vehicle No.OD10V-8167 regarding clash of timings.

Sri Santanu Das, Advocate for objector Sri Gupta submitted that the applicant Sri Maheswar Bisoi is holding permanent permit in respect of self same vehicle in another route. Sri H.P. Mohanty, Advocate has filed objection on behalf of B. Kalabati Patra.

The STA after due deliberation decided to reject the application filed by Sri Maheswar Bisoi for suppression of fact and to notify the route in website inviting applications for grant of permanent permit in the interest of commuting public.

ITEM NO.1.11:- AMBIKI TO KHEJURI VIA.CUTTACK, CHANDIKHOLE, BALASORE, SOLEPETA, EGRA, CONTAI & BACK.

Pursuant to the advertisement published in website and daily Odia newspaper "The Samaj" and English Newspaper "The Times of India" on 04.07.2023 inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the interstate route Ambik to Khejuri via. Cuttack, Chandikhole, Balasore, Solepeta, Egra, Contai &

24.8

back. **Sri Kasinath Mahala**, owner of vehicle No.**OD05R-9192** has filed application for grant of permanent permit in the aforesaid route.

Applicant, **Sri Kasinath Mahala**, owner of vehicle No.**OD05R-9192** was represented by advocate Sri M.B.K. Rao. He has submitted the Bank Guarantee and self-declaration in Annexure-A and B.

As per Vahan data no e-challan has been drawn under section 192 (A) of M.V Act 1988 against above stage carriage owned by the applicant within one year prior to date of consideration of present application.

The STA, West Bengal in their letter No.709-STA(5), dated 27.12.2022, intimated that stage carriage below BS-IV compliant shall not be granted permanent permit on any Interstate route between Odisha and West Bengal. On verification from Vahan-4 database it is seen that, the vehicle OD05R-9192 is of BS-III compliant.

The STA after due deliberation decided to reject the application filed by **Sri Kasinath Mahala**, owner of vehicle No.**OD05R-9192** and to notify the route in website inviting applications for grant of permanent permit in the interest of commuting public.

ITEM NO.1.12:- DHAMARA TO CONTAI VIA. BALASORE, JALESWAR, SOLEPETA, EGRA & BACK.

Pursuant to the advertisement published in website and daily Odia newspaper "The Samaj" and English Newspaper "The Times of India" on 04.07.2023 inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the interstate route **Dhamara to Contai via.Balasore, Jaleswar, Solepeta, Egra & back**. **Sri Bhaktananda Jena**, owner of vehicle No.**OR21E-7051** has filed application for grant of permanent permit in the aforesaid route.

Applicant, **Sri Bhaktananda Jena**, owner of vehicle No.**OR21E-7051** was represented by advocate Sri A.K. Behera. He has submitted the self-declaration in Annexure-A and B.

Financial Stability of the applicant cannot be adjudged in absence of Solvency Certificate/Bank Guarantee as required under Section 71 (3) (d) (i) of M.V Act 1988.

The STA, West Bengal in their letter No.709-STA(5), dated 27.12.2022, intimated that stage carriage below BS-IV compliant shall not be granted permanent permit on any Interstate route between Odisha and West Bengal. On verification from Vahan-4 database it is seen that, the vehicle **OR21E-7051** is of BS-III compliant.

The STA after due deliberation decided to reject the application filed by **Sri Bhaktananda Jena** for non-submission of Solvency Certificate/Bank Guarantee and suppression of fact and to notify the route in website inviting applications for grant of permanent permit in the interest of commuting public.

ITEM NO.1.13:- DHAMARA TO CONTAI VIA.BASUDEVPUR, HALDIPADA, RAJGHAT, JALESWAR, SOLEPETA, EGRA & BACK.

Pursuant to the advertisement published in website and daily Odia newspaper "The Samaj" and English Newspaper "The Times of India" on **04.07.2023** inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the interstate route **Dhamara to Contai via. Basudevpur, Haldipada, Rajghat, Jaleswar, Solepeta, Egra & back.** **Sri Subasish Dwibedi**, owner of vehicle No.**OR22E-5454** has filed application for grant of permanent permit in the aforesaid route.

Applicant, **Sri Subasish Dwibedi**, owner of vehicle No.**OR22E-5454** was represented by advocate **Sri S. Mishra**. He has submitted the Solvency Certificate and self-declaration in Annexure-A and B.

As per Vahan data no e-challan has been drawn under section 192 (A) of M.V Act 1988 against above stage carriage owned by the applicant within one year prior to date of consideration of present application.

The STA, West Bengal in their letter No.709-STA(5), dated 27.12.2022, intimated that stage carriage below BS-IV compliant shall not be granted permanent permit on any Interstate route between Odisha and West Bengal. On verification from Vahan-4 database it is seen that, the vehicle **OR22E-5454** is of BS-II compliant.

The STA after due deliberation decided to reject the application filed by **Sri Subasish Dwibedi**, owner of vehicle No.**OR22E-5454** and to notify the route in website inviting applications for grant of permanent permit in the interest of commuting public.



ITEM NO.1.14:- ROURKELA TO BHILAI VIA.SAMBALPUR & BACK.

Pursuant to the advertisement published in website and daily Odia newspaper "The Samaj" and English Newspaper "The Times of India" on 04.07.2023 inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the interstate route Rourkela to Bhilai via. Sambalpur & back. Sri Chandragupta Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OD16K-0325 has filed application for grant of permanent permit in the aforesaid route.

Applicant, Sri Chandragupta Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OD16K-0325 was represented by advocate Sri H.P. Mohanty. He has submitted the Bank Guarantee and self-declaration in Annexure-A and B.

As per Vahan data no e-challan has been drawn under section 192 (A) of M.V Act 1988 against above stage carriage owned by the applicant within one year prior to date of consideration of present application.

After due deliberation, it was decided to grant permanent stage carriage permit to Sri Chandragupta Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OD16K-0325 in the Interstate route Rourkela to Bhilai via. Sambalpur & back to perform two one trip daily as AC Deluxe Sleeper service, subject to verification of original documents submitted by him. The permit is valid subject to grant of countersignature by STA, Chhatisgarh. The permit holder will get the permit countersigned within 90 days failing which the permit is liable to be cancelled. The grantee shall lift the permit within a period of 30 days from the date of communication of grant order, failing which the grant order shall deem to be revoked. Before issue of permit, tax payment position, audit and e-challan clearance should be obtained and it should be ensured that the vehicle was not off-road on the date of application and on the date of consideration.

ITEM NO.1.15:- ROURKELA TO RAIPUR VIA.SAMBALPUR, LOHARCHATI & BACK.

Pursuant to the advertisement published in website and daily Odia newspaper "The Samaj" and English Newspaper "The Times of India" on 04.07.2023 inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the interstate route Rourkela to Raipur via.Sambalpur, Loharchati & back. M/s Kunal Transport,



Prop. Sri Om Prakash Gupta, owner of vehicle No.**OD16J-9681** has filed application for grant of permanent permit in the aforesaid route.

Applicant, **M/s Kunal Transport, Prop. Sri Om Prakash Gupta**, owner of vehicle No.**OD16J-9681** was represented by advocate Sri H.P. Mohanty. He has submitted the Solvency Certificate and self-declaration in Annexure-A and B.

As per Vahan data no e-challan has been drawn under section 192 (A) of M.V Act 1988 against above stage carriage owned by the applicant within one year prior to date of consideration of present application.

After due deliberation, it was decided to grant permanent stage carriage permit to **M/s Kunal Transport, Prop. Sri Om Prakash Gupta**, owner of vehicle No.**OD16J-9681** in the Interstate route **Rourkela to Raipur via. Sambalpur, Loharchati & back** to perform one trip daily as express service, subject to verification of original documents submitted by him. The permit is valid subject to grant of countersignature by STA, Chhatisgarh. The permit holder will get the permit countersigned within 90 days failing which the permit is liable to be cancelled. The grantee shall lift the permit within a period of 30 days from the date of communication of grant order, failing which the grant order shall deem to be revoked. Before issue of permit, tax payment position, audit and e-challan clearance should be obtained and it should be ensured that the vehicle was not off-road on the date of application and on the date of consideration.

ITEM NO.1.16:- BARBIL TO CHAIBASA VIA.CHAMPUA, JAYANTGARH & BACK.

Pursuant to the advertisement published in website and daily Odia newspaper "The Samaj" and English Newspaper "The Times of India" on **04.07.2023** inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the interstate route **Barbil to Chaibasa via.Champua, Jayantgarh & back**. **Khizir Hayat**, owner of vehicle No.**OD09V-6977** has filed application for grant of permanent permit in the aforesaid route.

Applicant, **Khizir Hayat**, owner of vehicle No.**OD09V-6977** is absent on call. He has submitted the Solvency Certificate and self-declaration in Annexure-A and B.



As per Vahan data no e-challan has been drawn under section 192 (A) of M.V Act 1988 against above stage carriage owned by the applicant within one year prior to date of consideration of present application.

After due deliberation, it was decided to grant permanent stage carriage permit to **Khizir Hayat**, owner of vehicle No.**OD09V-6977** in the Interstate route **Barbil to Chaibasa via. Champua, Jayantgarh & back** to perform two trips daily as deluxe nature of service, subject to verification of original documents submitted by him. The permit is valid subject to grant of countersignature by STA, Jharkhand. The permit holder will get the permit countersigned within 90 days failing which the permit is liable to be cancelled. The grantee shall lift the permit within a period of 30 days from the date of communication of grant order, failing which the grant order shall deem to be revoked. Before issue of permit, tax payment position, audit and e-challan clearance should be obtained and it should be ensured that the vehicle was not off-road on the date of application and on the date of consideration.

ITEM NO.1.17:- BARGARH TO RAIPUR VIA.SOHELA, LOHARCHATI, PITHODA, ARANGA & BACK.

Pursuant to the advertisement published in website and daily Odia newspaper "The Samaj" and English Newspaper "The Times of India" on **04.07.2023** inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the interstate route **Bargarh to Raipur via.Sohela, Loharchati, Pithoda, Aranga & back**. **Sri Nitesh Sharma**, owner of vehicle No.**OD17AA-4774** has filed application for grant of permanent permit in the aforesaid route.

Applicant, **Sri Nitesh Sharma**, owner of vehicle No.**OD17AA-4774** is absent on call. He has submitted the Solvency Certificate and self-declaration in Annexure-A and B.

As per Vahan data no e-challan has been drawn under section 192 (A) of M.V Act 1988 against above stage carriage owned by the applicant within one year prior to date of consideration of present application.

After due deliberation, it is decided to grant permanent stage carriage permit to **Sri Nitesh Sharma**, owner of vehicle No.**OD17AA-4774** in the Interstate route



Bargarh to Raipur via.Sohela, Loharchati, Pithoda, Aranga & back as ordinary nature of service, subject to verification of original documents submitted by him. The permit is valid subject to grant of countersignature by STA, Chhatisgarh. The permit holder will get the permit countersigned within 90 days failing which the permit is liable to be cancelled. The grantee shall lift the permit within a period of 30 days from the date of communication of grant order, failing which the grant order shall deem to be revoked. Before issue of permit, tax payment position, audit and e-challan clearance should be obtained and it should be ensured that the vehicle was not off-road on the date of application and on the date of consideration.

ITEM NO.1.18:- JHARADIHI TO SARAIKELA VIA.TATA, TIRING & BACK.

Pursuant to the advertisement published in website and daily Odia newspaper "The Samaj" and English Newspaper "The Times of India" on **04.07.2023** inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the interstate route **Jharadihi to Saraikela via.Tata, Tiring & back. Mohsin Iqbal Ansari**, owner of vehicle No.**OD09V-6377** has filed application for grant of permanent permit in the aforesaid route.

Applicant, **Mohsin Iqbal Ansari**, owner of vehicle No.**OD09V-6377** is absent on call. He has submitted the Solvency Certificate and self-declaration in Annexure-A and B.

As per Vahan data no e-challan has been drawn under section 192 (A) of M.V Act 1988 against above stage carriage owned by the applicant within one year prior to date of consideration of present application.

After due deliberation, it is decided to grant permanent stage carriage permit to **Mohsin Iqbal Ansari**, owner of vehicle No.**OD09V-6377** in the Interstate route **Jharadihi to Saraikela via.Tata, Tiring & back** to perform two trips daily as ordinary nature of service, subject to verification of original documents submitted by him. The permit is valid subject to grant of countersignature by STA, Jharkhand. The permit holder will get the permit countersigned within 90 days failing which the permit is liable to be cancelled. The grantee shall lift the permit within a period of 30 days from the date of communication of grant order, failing which the grant order shall deem to



be revoked. Before issue of permit, tax payment position, audit and e-challan clearance should be obtained and it should be ensured that the vehicle was not off-road on the date of application and on the date of consideration.

ITEM NO.1.19:- BALIAPAL TO KOLKATA VIA.LAXMANNATH & BACK.

Pursuant to the advertisement published in website and daily Odia newspaper "The Samaj" and English Newspaper "The Times of India" on **04.07.2023** inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the interstate route **Baliapal to Kolkata via.Laxmannath & back. Sri Smruti Ranjan Padhi**, owner of vehicle No.**OR11M-2439** has filed application for grant of permanent permit in the aforesaid route.

Applicant, **Sri Smruti Ranjan Padhi**, owner of vehicle No.**OR11M-2439** is represented by Advocate Sri A.K. Behera. He has submitted self-declaration in Annexure-A and B. He has submitted a Solvency Certificate which has expired since 01.03.2022.

Financial Stability of the applicant cannot be adjudged in absence of Solvency Certificate/Bank Guarantee as required under Section 71 (3) (d) (i) of M.V Act 1988.

The STA, West Bengal in their letter No.709-STA(5), dated 27.12.2022, intimated that stage carriage below BS-IV compliant shall not be granted permanent permit on any Interstate route between Odisha and West Bengal. On verification from Vahan-4 database it is seen that, the vehicle OR11M-2439 is of BS-III compliant.

The STA after due deliberation decided to reject the application filed by **Sri Smruti Ranjan Padhi**, owner of vehicle No.**OR11M-2439** for non-submission of Solvency Certificate/Bank Guarantee and to notify the route in website inviting applications for grant of permanent permit in the interest of commuting public.

ITEM NO.1.20:- PURI TO AMBIKAPUR VIA.JHARSUGUDA & BACK.

Pursuant to the advertisement published in official website on **12.07.2023** inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the interstate route **Puri to Ambikapur via. Jharsuguda & back. M/s Kunal Transport, Prop.**



Om Prakash Gupta, owner of vehicle No.**OD16J-9657** has filed application for grant of permanent permit in the aforesaid route.

Applicant, **M/s Kunal Transport, Prop. Om Prakash Gupta**, owner of vehicle No.**OD16J-9657** is represented by advocate Sri H.P. Mohanty. He has submitted Solvency Certificate and self-declaration in Annexure-A and B.

As per Vahan data no e-challan has been drawn under section 192 (A) of M.V Act 1988 against above stage carriage owned by the applicant within one year prior to date of consideration of present application.

After due deliberation, it was decided to grant permanent stage carriage permit to **M/s Kunal Transport, Prop. Om Prakash Gupta**, owner of vehicle No.**OD16J-9657** in the Interstate route **Puri to Ambikapur via.Jharsuguda & back** as deluxe nature of service, subject to verification of original documents submitted by him. The permit is valid subject to grant of countersignature by STA, Jharkhand. The permit holder will get the permit countersigned within 90 days failing which the permit is liable to be cancelled. The grantee shall lift the permit within a period of 30 days from the date of communication of grant order, failing which the grant order shall deem to be revoked. Before issue of permit, tax payment position, audit and e-challan clearance should be obtained and it should be ensured that the vehicle was not off-road on the date of application and on the date of consideration.

ITEM NO.1.21:- PURI TO AMBIKAPUR VIA.JHARSUGUDA & BACK.

Pursuant to the advertisement published in official website on **12.07.2023** inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the interstate route **Puri to Ambikapur via.Jharsuguda & back. M/s Kunal Transport, Prop.Om Prakash Gupta**, owner of vehicle No.**OD16J-9637** has filed application for grant of permanent permit in the aforesaid route.

Applicant, **M/s Kunal Transport, Prop. Om Prakash Gupta**, owner of vehicle No.**OD16J-9637** is represented by advocate Sri H.P. Mohanty. He has submitted Solvency Certificate and self-declaration in Annexure-A and B.



As per Vahan data no e-challan has been drawn under section 192 (A) of M.V Act 1988 against above stage carriage owned by the applicant within one year prior to date of consideration of present application.

After due deliberation, it was decided to grant permanent stage carriage permit to **M/s Kunal Transport, Prop. Om Prakash Gupta**, owner of vehicle No.**OD16J-9637** in the Interstate route **Puri to Ambikapur via Jharsuguda & back** as deluxe nature of service, subject to verification of original documents submitted by him. The permit is valid subject to grant of countersignature by STA, Jharkhand. The permit holder will get the permit countersigned within 90 days failing which the permit is liable to be cancelled. The grantee shall lift the permit within a period of 30 days from the date of communication of grant order, failing which the grant order shall deem to be revoked. Before issue of permit, tax payment position, audit and e-challan clearance should be obtained and it should be ensured that the vehicle was not off-road on the date of application and on the date of consideration.

ITEM NO.1.22:- PADAMPUR TO SARAIPALI & BACK.

Pursuant to the advertisement published in website and daily Odia newspaper "**The Samaj**" and English Newspaper "**The Times of India**" on **04.07.2023** inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the interstate route **Padampur to Saraipali** and back. **Seikh Samiul Hossain**, owner of vehicle No.**OD17AA-4555** has filed application for grant of permanent permit in the aforesaid route.

Applicant, **Seikh Samiul Hossain**, owner of vehicle No.**OD17AA-4555** was absent on call. He has submitted Solvency Certificate and self-declaration in Annexure-A and B.

As per Vahan data no e-challan has been drawn under section 192 (A) of M.V Act 1988 against above stage carriage owned by the applicant within one year prior to date of consideration of present application.

On verification it is found that the vehicle **OD17AA-4555** is having seating capacity 25+6 standees. The STA decided earlier not to grant permit to 25 seater stage carriage.

24.8

The STA after due deliberation decided to reject the application filed by **Seikh Samiul Hossain**, owner of vehicle No.**OD17AA-4555** as the vehicle is of 25 seater and to notify the route in website inviting applications for grant of permanent permit in the interest of commuting public.

ITEM NO.1.23:- PADAMPUR TO SARAIPALI & BACK.

Pursuant to the advertisement published in website and daily Odia newspaper "The Samaj" and English Newspaper "The Times of India" on **04.07.2023** inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the interstate route **Padampur to Saraipali** and back. **Smt. Anjali Meher**, owner of vehicle No.**OD17F-7011** has filed application for grant of permanent permit in the aforesaid route.

Applicant, **Smt. Anjali Meher**, owner of vehicle No.**OD17F-7011** is represented by Advocate Sri J.N. Mohanty. She has submitted Solvency Certificate and self-declaration in Annexure-A and B.

As per Vahan data no e-challan has been drawn under section 192 (A) of M.V Act 1988 against above stage carriage owned by the applicant within one year prior to date of consideration of present application.

After due deliberation, it was decided to grant permanent stage carriage permit to **Smt. Anjali Meher**, owner of vehicle No.**OD17F-7011** in the Interstate route **Padampur to Saraipali** and back to perform four trips daily as ordinary nature of service, subject to verification of original documents submitted by her. The permit is valid subject to grant of countersignature by STA, Chhatisgarh. The permit holder will get the permit countersigned within 90 days failing which the permit is liable to be cancelled. The grantee shall lift the permit within a period of 30 days from the date of communication of grant order, failing which the grant order shall deem to be revoked. Before issue of permit, tax payment position, audit and e-challan clearance should be obtained and it should be ensured that the vehicle was not off-road on the date of application and on the date of consideration.



ITEM NO.1.24:- BHUBANESWAR TO HATA VIA.RAIRANGPUR, TIRING & BACK.

Pursuant to the advertisement published in official website on 12.07.2023 inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the interstate route **Bhubaneswar to Hata via.Rairangpur, Tiring** and back. **Smt. Nirmala Agrawalla**, owner of vehicle No.**OD11W-7414** has filed application for grant of permanent permit in the aforesaid route.

Applicant, **Smt. Nirmala Agrawalla**, owner of vehicle No.**OD11W-7414** is represented by Advocate Sri H.P. Mohanty. She has submitted Solvency Certificate and self-declaration in Annexure-A and B.

As per Vahan data no e-challan has been drawn under section 192 (A) of M.V Act 1988 against above stage carriage owned by the applicant within one year prior to date of consideration of present application.

After due deliberation, it was decided to grant permanent stage carriage permit to **Smt. Nirmala Agrawalla**, owner of vehicle No.**OD11W-7414** in the Interstate route **Bhubaneswar to Hata via. Rairangpur, Tiring** and back as AC Deluxe Sleeper service, subject to verification of original documents submitted by her. The permit is valid subject to grant of countersignature by STA, Jharkhand. The permit holder will get the permit countersigned within 90 days failing which the permit is liable to be cancelled. The grantee shall lift the permit within a period of 30 days from the date of communication of grant order, failing which the grant order shall deem to be revoked. Before issue of permit, tax payment position, audit and e-challan clearance should be obtained and it should be ensured that the vehicle was not off-road on the date of application and on the date of consideration.

ITEM NO.1.25:- BHUBANESWAR TO HATA VIA.RAIRANGPUR, TIRING & BACK.

Pursuant to the advertisement published in official website on 12.07.2023 inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the interstate route **Bhubaneswar to Hata via.Rairangpur, Tiring** and back. **Sri Arun Kumar Agrawalla**, owner of vehicle No.**OD11W-7404** has filed application for grant of permanent permit in the aforesaid route.



Applicant, **Sri Arun Kumar Agrawalla**, owner of vehicle No.**OD11W-7404** is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.K. Rao. He has submitted Solvency Certificate and self-declaration in Annexure-A and B.

As per Vahan data no e-challan has been drawn under section 192 (A) of M.V Act 1988 against above stage carriage owned by the applicant within one year prior to date of consideration of present application.

After due deliberation, it was decided to grant permanent stage carriage permit to **Sri Arun Kumar Agrawalla**, owner of vehicle No.**OD11W-7404** in the Interstate route **Bhubaneswar to Hata via.Rairangpur, Tiring** and back as AC Deluxe Sleeper service, subject to verification of original documents submitted by him. The permit is valid subject to grant of countersignature by STA, Jharkhand. The permit holder will get the permit countersigned within 90 days failing which the permit is liable to be cancelled. The grantee shall lift the permit within a period of 30 days from the date of communication of grant order, failing which the grant order shall deem to be revoked. Before issue of permit, tax payment position, audit and e-challan clearance should be obtained and it should be ensured that the vehicle was not off-road on the date of application and on the date of consideration.

ITEM NO.1.26:- CHANDINIPAL TO KHEJURI VIA.BASUDEVPUR, HALADIPADA, JALESWAR, MOHANPUR, CONTAI & BACK.

Pursuant to the advertisement published in website and daily Odia newspaper "The Samaj" and English Newspaper "The Times of India" on **04.07.2023** inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the interstate route **Chandinipal to Khejuri via.Basudevpur, Haladipada, Jaleswar, Mohanpur, Contai & back**. **Sri Ajay Kumar Panda**, owner of vehicle No.**OR02BU-0057** has filed application for grant of permanent permit in the aforesaid route.

Applicant, **Sri Ajay Kumar Panda**, owner of vehicle No.**OR02BU-0057** is represented by Advocate Sri Sabyasachi Mishra. He has submitted self-declaration in Annexure-A and B.

Advocate for the applicant stated that, he wants to withdraw his application. The application is rejected as withdrawn.



The STA after due deliberation decided to notify the route in website inviting applications for grant of permanent permit in the interest of commuting public.

ITEM NO.1.27:- CHANDINIPAL TO KHEJURI VIA.BASUDEVPUR, HALADIPADA, JALESWAR, MOHANPUR, CONTAI & BACK.

Pursuant to the advertisement published in website and daily Odia newspaper "The Samaj" and English Newspaper "The Times of India" on 04.07.2023 inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the interstate route Chandinipal to Khejuri via.Basudevpur, Haladipada, Jaleswar, Mohanpur, Contai & back. Sri Bhaktananda Jena, owner of vehicle No.OR21E-7051 has filed application for grant of permanent permit in the aforesaid route.

Applicant, Sri Bhaktananda Jena, owner of vehicle No.OR21E-7051 is represented by Advocate Sri A.K. Behera. He has submitted Bank Guarantee and self-declaration in Annexure-A and B.

As per Vahan data no e-challan has been drawn under section 192 (A) of M.V Act 1988 against above stage carriage owned by the applicant within one year prior to date of consideration of present application.

The STA, West Bengal in their letter No.709-STA(5), dated 27.12.2022, intimated that stage carriage below BS-IV compliant shall not be granted permanent permit on any Interstate route between Odisha and West Bengal. On verification from Vahan-4 database it is seen that, the vehicle OR21E-7051 is of BS-III compliant.

One objection has been received from the learned advocate of behalf of Suchismita Palai, owner of vehicle No.OR05AE-0621 and OD01R-4646 regarding clash of timings.

The STA after due deliberation decided to reject the application filed by Sri Bhaktananda Jena, owner of vehicle No.OR21E-7051 and to notify the route in website inviting applications for grant of permanent permit in the interest of commuting public.



2. INTER-STATE ROUTES (MULTI APPLICATIONS)

ITEM NO.2.1:- DHAMARA TO CONTAI VIA.BASUDEVPUR, ANANTAPUR, GOPALPUR, BALASORE, JALESWAR, SOLEPETA, EGRA & BACK.

Pursuant to the advertisement published in website and daily Odia newspaper "The Samaj" and English Newspaper "The Times of India" on 04.07.2023 inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the interstate route Dhamara to Contai via.Basudevpur, Anantapur, Gopalpur, Balasore, Jaleswar, Solepeta, Egra and back.

The following applications have applied for grant of permanent permit on the above vacancy as detailed below.

1- Sri Ajay Kumar Panda, owner of vehicle No.OR02BU-0057

2- Sri Subasish Dwibedy, owner of vehicle No.OR22E-5454

Applicant Sri Ajay Kumar Panda, owner of vehicle No.OR02BU-0057 is represented by advocate Sri A.K. Behera. He has submitted self declaration in Annexure-A & B and valid Bank Guarantee.

The STA, West Bengal in their letter No.709-STA(5), dated 27.12.2022, intimated that stage carriage below BS-IV compliant shall not be granted permanent permit on any Interstate route between Odisha and West Bengal. On verification from Vahan-4 database it is seen that, the vehicle OR02BU-0057 is of BS-III compliant.

It was therefore, decided to reject the application filed by Sri Ajay Kumar Panda, owner of vehicle No.OR02BU-0057.

Applicant Sri Subasish Dwibedy, owner of vehicle No.OR22E-5454 is represented by advocate Shri Sabyasachi Mishra. He has submitted self declaration in Annexure-A & B and valid Solvency Certificate.

Advocate for the applicant stated that, he wants to withdraw his application. The application is rejected as withdrawn.

The STA after due deliberation decided to notify the route in website inviting applications for grant of permanent permit in the interest of commuting public.



ITEM NO.2.2:- PURI TO SAREIKELA VIA.BHADRAK, BARIPADA, JAMSOLA & BACK.

Pursuant to the advertisement published in website and daily Odia newspaper "The Samaj" and English Newspaper "The Times of India" on 04.07.2023 inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the interstate route Puri to Sareikela via.Bhadrak, Baripada, Jamsola & back.

The following applications have been received for grant of permanent permit on the above vacancy as detailed below.

- 1- Sri Sagar Kumar, owner of vehicle No.OD02AU-5225
- 2- Sri Ranjan Kumar Jena, owner of vehicle No.OD05BM-2985
- 3- Shantilata Choudhury, owner of vehicle No.OD04S-1125

Applicant Sri Sagar Kumar, owner of vehicle No.OD02AU-5225 is absent on call. He has submitted self declaration in Annexure-A & B. He has not submitted valid Bank Guarantee/Solvency Certificate.

Financial Stability of the applicant cannot be adjudged in absence of Solvency Certificate/Bank Guarantee as required under Section 71 (3) (d) (i) of M.V Act 1988.

The STA after due deliberation decided to reject the application filed by Sri Sagar Kumar, owner of vehicle No.OD02AU-5225 for non-submission of Solvency Certificate/Bank Guarantee.

Applicant Sri Ranjan Kumar Jena, owner of vehicle No.OD05BM-2985 is represented by Sri M.B.K. Rao. He has submitted self declaration in Annexure-A & B and valid Bank Guarantee.

On verification of application filed by Sri Ranjan Kumar Jena it is found that, he has submitted Annexure-A and B disclosing that he is the owner of vehicle OD05BM-2985, OR05AG-1149, OR05X-2091 and OD05AZ-5592 suppressing the fact that he owns other vehicles i.e. OD17W-9148, OR02Y-7317 and OR05AC-1038.

The STA after due deliberation decided to reject the application filed by Sri Ranjan Kumar Jena for suppression of fact.

Applicant Smt. Shantilata Choudhury, owner of vehicle No.OD04S-1125 is represented by Sri Sabyasachi Mishra. She has submitted self declaration in Annexure-A & B and valid Bank Guarantee.



As per Vahan data no e-challan has been drawn under section 192 (A) of M.V Act 1988 against above stage carriage owned by the applicant within one year prior to date of consideration of present application.

After due deliberation, it was decided to grant permanent stage carriage permit to **Shantilata Choudhury**, owner of vehicle No.**OD04S-1125** in the Interstate route **Puri to Sareikela via.Bhadrak, Baripada, Jamsola & back** as AC Deluxe Sleeper service, subject to verification of original documents submitted by him. The permit is valid subject to grant of countersignature by STA, Jharkhand. The permit holder will get the permit countersigned within 90 days failing which the permit is liable to be cancelled. The grantee shall lift the permit within a period of 30 days from the date of communication of grant order, failing which the grant order shall deem to be revoked. Before issue of permit, tax payment position, audit and e-challan clearance should be obtained and it should be ensured that the vehicle was not off-road on the date of application and on the date of consideration.

ITEM NO.2.3:- BHUBANESWAR TO NANDAKUMAR VIA.BALASORE, EGRA, LAXMANNATH, BAJKUL & BACK.

Pursuant to the advertisement published in website and daily Odia newspaper "The Samaj" and English Newspaper "The Times of India" on **04.07.2023** inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the interstate route **Bhubaneswar to Nandakumar via.Balasore, Laxmannath, Egra, Bajkul & back.**

The following applications have been received for grant of permanent permit on the above vacancy as detailed below.

- 1- Sri Debasish Patra, owner of vehicle No.OD05Z-9195**
- 2- Sri Arun Kumar Lakhani, owner of vehicle No.OD22L-7383**

Applicant Sri Debasish Patra, owner of vehicle No.OD05Z-9195 is represented by advocate Sri M.B.K. Rao. He has submitted self declaration in Annexure-A & B and valid Bank Guarantee.

On verification of application filed by Sri Debasish Patra it is found that, he has submitted Annexure-A and B disclosing that he is the owner of vehicle OR05AD-

9192, OD05AM-9192, OD05AL-0492, OD05Z-9195 and OD02AS-9195 suppressing the fact that he owns another one vehicle i.e. OIC-9192.

The STA after due deliberation decided to reject the application filed by Sri Debasish Patra for suppression of fact.

Applicant Sri Arun Kumar Lakhani, owner of vehicle No.OD22L-7383 is absent on call. He has submitted self declaration in Annexure-A & B and valid Bank Guarantee.

On verification of application filed by Sri Arun Kumar Lakhani it is found that, he has submitted Annexure-A and B disclosing that he is the owner of vehicle OD22R-7383, OD22E-7383 and OD22L-7383 suppressing the fact that he owns another one vehicle i.e. OR05D-5783.

The STA after due deliberation decided to reject the application filed by Sri Arun Kumar Lakhani for suppression of fact.

The STA after due deliberation decided to reject both the applications filed by the above mentioned applicants and to notify the route in website inviting applications for grant of permanent permit in the interest of commuting public.

3. INTERSTATE CASE MATTER

ITEM NO.3.1:- CANCELLATION OF PERMANENT PERMIT BEARING NO.57-R-2017 ISSUED TO VEHICLE NO.OR02AS-8229 OPERATING IN THE INTERSTATE ROUTE CHANDBALI TO KOLKATA VIA.LAXMANNATH & BACK.

Permanent permit No.57-R-2017 was issued in favour of Sri Rabindra Kumar Das in respect of vehicle No.OR02AS-8229 (model – 12/2007) to operate in the Interstate route Chandbali to Kolkata via. Laxmannath & back w.e.f. 05.01.2018 to 04.01.2023. Heard Sri Sabyasachi Mishra, Advocate for permit holder and considered show cause filed by him.

Learned advocate appearing on behalf of Sri Das submitted that the permit holder has filed an application on 16.12.2022 for renewal of permanent permit in respect of the above mentioned vehicle. He stated that, the permit holder Sri Rabindra Kumar Das is more than 72 years old and finance companies/Banks are reluctant to finance him for purchase of higher model vehicle. He prayed that permit



may be renewed and replacement of vehicle OR02AS-8229 by OD02BD-2199 may be considered.

On verification from Vahan-4 database, it is seen that the vehicle OR02AS-8229 has been kept off-road for the period from 01.04.2018 to 30.06.2018 (three months), 01.11.2018 to 31.10.2019 (one year), 01.04.2020 to 30.06.2020 (three months), 01.08.2020 to 31.10.2020 (three months) and 01.05.2021 to 31.10.2021 (six months). While computing the off-road period of vehicle after excluding the period of COVID-19 i.e. 01.01.2020 to 31.10.2021, the total period of off-road comes to one year and three months i.e. 01.04.2018 to 30.06.2018 and 01.11.2018 to 31.10.2019.

The permit holder stated that his bus OR02AS-8229 is more than 15 years old. His vehicle was sent to garage for major body reconstruction, coloring and other mechanical repair work during 2019. There was delay in carrying out repair work by the garage. After repair he started operating the vehicle OR02AS-8229 during October, 2019 and thereafter due to COVID – 19 situation, the bus could not operate.

The applicant admitted that his bus has not operated in the given route from 01.04.2018 to 30.06.2018 and 01.11.2018 to 31.10.2019 (one year three months) causing inconvenience to travelling public. The permit holder also did not intimate the STA about non-operation of bus from 01.04.2018 to 30.06.2018 and 01.11.2018 to 31.10.2019 as required under rule 75 (3) of OMV Rules, 1993.

Under the statute, it is the STA to look after the convenience of travelling public commuting from Chandbali to Kolkata. Non-plying of bus by the petitioner for more than one year three months is bound to cause inconvenience to travelling public from 01.04.2018 to 30.06.2018 and 01.11.2018 to 31.10.2019. The commuting public had suffered a lot due to non-operation of bus by the petitioner from 01.04.2018 to 30.06.2018 and 01.11.2018 to 31.10.2019. For such deficiency in providing serviced to public by the petitioner, her conduct as stage carriage operator found to be not satisfactory.

STA in its 291st meeting held on date 19.02.2020 has decided that, **“where the vehicle for which permanent stage carriage permit was issued in a route/routes had been declared off-road for a period of one year during**

currency of permit in different spells, renewal of such permit shall not be considered. Besides, steps will also be taken for cancellation of permit before its expiry U/s 86 of M.V Act 1988. The permit holder will furnish/upload self declaration in Annexure-C at the time of making application for renewal of permit".

The permit holder did not operate his vehicle from 01.04.2018 to 30.06.2018 and 01.11.2018 to 31.10.2019 i.e. one year and three months without intimating the fact of non-operation of her vehicle to STA violating permit conditions. The members of STA, after due deliberation, are of the view that the permit holder has failed to operate the bus in the given route for one year and three months and thereby violated permit condition. Decision of STA to cancel the permit due to non operation is squarely applicable to the present case.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, provisions of law and decision taken by STA in 291st meeting, it was resolved to reject application for renewal of permanent permit No.57-R-2017 and replacement of vehicle OR02AS-8229 by OD02BD-2199 issued to Sri Rabindra Kumar Das in the route Chandbali to Kolkata for violating permit conditions. Consequent upon rejection of application for renewal of permanent permit, application for replacement of vehicle is rejected. It was resolved that the route be notified in website of STA inviting applications for grant of permanent permit from deserving stage carriage operator.

ITEM NO.3.2:- OBJECTION AGAINST SMT. PUSPANJALI GAANA, OWNER OF VEHICLE NO.OD01AC-7171.

The matter was placed in the 300th STA meeting held on 24.03.2023 and following decision taken.

"Considering submission made by parties, it was decided to reject the prayer made by Smt. Puspanjali Gaana that change of alignment of route Puri to Tamluk, as same has not been notified under Section 88 (6) of M.V. Act, 1988 in the Reciprocal Transport Agreement. The stoppage "Bhagabanpur" be inserted in the permit issued to Puspanjali Gaana in the interstate route Puri to Tamluk in terms of Reciprocal Transport Agreement. The permit holder is directed to submit original part-A and B permit for necessary correction failing



which the matter may be placed in the next STA meeting for cancellation of permanent permit for plying his vehicle unauthorisedly."

Sri Ramasis Acharya, Advocate appearing for Puspanjali Gaana submitted that in W.P. (C) No.15559 of 2023, Hon'ble High Court granted stay till 17.07.2023. He prayed to defer the matter.

The matter is deferred to next STA meeting.

ITEM NO.3.3:- PURI TO KOLKATA VIA. LAXMANNATH AND BACK.

The matter was placed in the 296th, 297th and 298th STA meeting and decision deferred due to pendency of M.V. appeal No.05 of 2022 before Hon'ble STAT.

Sri S.R. Pradhan, Advocate appearing for the permit holder submitted that stay granted by Hon'ble STAT is continuing and the appeal is subjudice. He prayed to defer the matter.

The matter is deferred to next STA meeting.

ITEM NO.3.4:- CANCELLATION OF PERMANENT PERMIT BEARING NO.14-R-2018 AND NO.16-R-2018 ISSUED TO VEHICLE NO.OD09P-0969 AND OD09K-9969 OPERATING IN THE INTERSTATE ROUTE JODA TO DHANBAD VIA.NALDA, CHAIBASA, HATA, TATA, PURULIA, CHASA & BACK.

Heard Sri H. P. Mohanty, Advocate for Aswini Kumar Mahanta, Objector and Sri P.K. Nanda, Advocate for Sashi Pujan permit holder.

Permanent permit No.14-R-2018 and 16-R-2018 are issued in favor of Sri Sashi Pujan in respect of vehicle No.OD09P-0969 and OD09K-9969 to operate in the Interstate route Joda to Dhanbad via. Nalda, Chaibasa, Hata, Tata, Purulia, Chasa & back valid till 04.07.2023 respectively.

Advocate for Aswini Kumar Mahanta, owner of vehicle No.OD11E-1503 filed objection against Sashi Pujan stating that Sri Pujan is the resident of Jharkhand and holding permits P.st.P. No.14/2015 and P. St.P No.96/2006 from Jharkhand quota. He obtained two permanent permits in the route Joda to Dhanbad from STA, Odisha in respect of vehicle OD09P-0969 and OD09K-9969 by misrepresentation and suppression of fact. The objector prayed that permanent permits issued to Sri Pujan in respect of vehicle OD09P-0969 and OD09K-9969 by overlooking the matter

without following provision of Section 68 of M.V. Act, 1988 and said permanent permits may be cancelled.

After receipt of objection, Sri Pujan was intimated vide this office letter No.4581 dated 08.04.2021 to furnish residence proof and Aadhaar card from local Tahasildar, Bolani, Keonjhar. In response to this office letter No.4581 dated 08.04.2021, he furnished copy of Aadhaar Card No.7930 7160 5484 wherein his address has been mention as House No.S/2R 328, Joda West Lower Camp, Barbil (m), Keonjhar, Odisha. He also furnished residence certificate in M.C. Case No.E-RES/2021/283619 dated 17.04.2021 issued by Revenue Officer, office of Tahasildar, Barbil in which it was mentioned that Sri Pujan is residing at Joda, Barbil for 16 years.

Advocate for permit holder Sashi Pujan submitted that the objector - Aswini Kumar Mahanta has no right to challenge grant of permits to Sashi Pujan in the route Joda to Dhanbad in view of law laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in 1992 AIR SCW 41. There is no clause in the Reciprocal Transport Agreement executed between Odisha and Jharkhand restricting the opp. party Sashi Pujan to apply for a stage carriage permit in the interstate route Joda to Dhanbad as he resides in State of Odisha. The permit holder has submitted Aadhaar Card and Residence Certificate to establish that he is residing in Odisha. His principal place of business is in Odisha. He cited decision of Hon'ble High Court of Orissa in similar nature of case W.P. (C) No.20339 of 2014 filed by Dinesh Mehta Vrs. STA, Odisha and others in which Hon'ble High Court quashed the decision of STA in which permanent permit of Dinesh Mehta was cancelled and revived the permit. He prayed that permanent permits granted to Sashi Pujan in the interstate route Joda to Dhanbad may not be cancelled and same may be renewed as has been applied for.

From records it reveals that permanent permit No.17-G/2013 was granted to Sashi Pujan in respect of vehicle OD09A-9069 to operate in the interstate route Joda to Dhanbad w.e.f. 05.07.2013 to 04.07.2018 and renewed thereafter up to 04.07.2023. The permit holder has applied for renewal of permit which is pending for consideration.

Permanent permit No.18-G/2013 was granted to Sashi Pujan in respect of vehicle OD09A-9969 to operate in the interstate route Joda to Dhanbad w.e.f.



05.07.2013 to 04.07.2018 and renewed thereafter up to 04.07.2023. The permit holder has applied for renewal of permit which is pending for consideration.

The objector- Aswini Kumar Mahanta is not the co-applicant at the time of grant of permit to Sashi Pujan. He has not filed objection at the time of grant of permit to Sashi Pujan in the aforesaid route. The objector being a rival operator has no right to object grant of permit to Sashi Pujan in view of law laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in 1992 AIR SCW 41.

After due deliberation it was resolved to reject the objection filed by Aswini Kumar Mahanta as he has no locus standi to file such objection. Permanent permit No.17-G/2013 and Permanent permit No.18-G/2013 are renewed subject to fulfillment of other statutory requirements.

4. INTER-REGION ROUTES (SINGLE APPLICATIONS)

ITEM NO.4.1:- THERUBALI TO JEYPORE VIA-LAXMIPUR, KAKRIGUMA AND BACK

Pursuant to the advertisement published in website and daily Odia newspaper "The Sambad" and English Newspaper "The New Indian Express" on 04.07.2023 inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the route Therubali to Jeypore Via- Laxmipur, Kakriguma and back, Sri Neeraj Kumar Turuk, owner of vehicle No.OD10W-0897 has filed application for grant of permanent permit in the aforesaid route.

Applicant Sri Neeraj Kumar Turuk, owner of vehicle No.OD10W-0897 was represented by Advocate Sri Sabyasachi Mishra. He has submitted Bank guarantee and self-declaration in Annexure-A and B.

As per Vahan data no VCR/e-Challan drawn under section 192-A of M.V. Act, 1988 against above stage carriage owned by the applicant within one year prior to date of consideration of present application.

After due deliberation it is decided to grant permanent stage carriage permit to Sri Neeraj Kumar Turuk, owner of vehicle No.OD10W-0897 in the inter-region vacant route Therubali to Jeypore Via- Laxmipur, Kakriguma and back to perform for a period of five years as ordinary Service subject to verification of original



documents submitted by him. Before issue of permit, tax payment position, audit and e-challan clearance should be obtained and it should be ensured that the vehicle was not off-road on the date of application and on the date of consideration.

ITEM NO.4.2:- BANAPUR TO PHULBANI VIA-NUAGAON, DASHPALLA AND BACK

Pursuant to the advertisement published in website and daily Odia newspaper "The Sambad" and English Newspaper "The New Indian Express" on 04.07.2023 inviting applications for grant of permanent stage carriage permit in the route Banapur to Phulbani, via-Nuagaon, Dashpalla and back, owner of vehicle No. OD02BK-0765 has filed application for grant of permanent permit in the aforesaid route.

Applicant **Sri Suresh Samantasinghar**, owner of vehicle No.OD02BK-0765 was represented by Advocate Sri Sabyasachi Mishra. He has not submitted Solvency Certificate.

Financial Stability of the applicant cannot be adjudged in absence of Solvency Certificate/Bank Guarantee as required under Section 71 (3) (d) (i) of M.V Act 1988.

The STA after due deliberation decided to reject the application filed by **Shri Suresh Samantasinghar**, owner of vehicle No.OD02BK-0765 for non-submission of Solvency Certificate / Bank Guarantee and to notify the route in website inviting applications for grant of permanent permit in the interest of commuting public.

ITEM NO.4.3:-APPROVAL OF TEMPORARY STAGE PERMIT GRANTED TO OSRTC FROM SERAGADA TO PURI MUNICIPALITY BUS STAND VIA- BARKUL, BALUGAON AND BACK.

Temporary stage carriage permit granted by Chairman, STA to OSRTC in respect of vehicle no.OD02AQ-4803 in the route Seragada to Puri Municipality Bus Stand via Barkul is approved.



5.

INTER-REGION CASE MATTER

ITEM NO.5.1:- CONSIDERATION OF RENEWAL OF PERMANENT PERMIT BEARING NO-PP99/170783/G ON THE ROUTE KOTAGADA TO BERHAMPUR VIA- BHANJANAGAR AND BACK IN RESPECT OF VEHICLE No.OD12B-2142 IN FAVOUR OF SRI PURNA CHANDRA DASH.

Heard Sri M.B.K. Rao, Advocate for Sri Purna Chandra Das. He submitted that renewal of permanent permit filed by the applicant may be considered though the applicant has applied after its expiry.

Permanent Permit PP99/170783/G on the route Kotagada to Berhampur via Bhanjanagar and back was granted in favour of Sri Purna Chandra Das owner of vehicle No.OD12B-2142 valid till 16.10.2022 w.e.f. 17.10.2017. Sri Das has filed application for renewal of permit on 02.06.2023 i.e. seven months after expiry of permit.

Submission made by Advocate for Sri Purna Chandra Das and show cause filed by him has been considered.

Under the statute, the STA has no power to renew the permanent permit in cases where the application for renewal of permit was filed after expiry of permit.

Section 81 (2) & (3) of M.V. Act, 1988 are quoted below for better appreciation.

“(2) A permit may be renewed on an application made not less than fifteen days before the date of its expiry.

(3) Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (2), the Regional Transport Authority or the State Transport Authority, as the case may be, may entertain an application for the renewal of a permit after the last date specified in that sub-section if it is satisfied that the applicant was prevented by goods and sufficient cause from making an application within the time specified.”

On plain reading of provisions contained under Section 81 (2) of M.V. Act, 1988, it can be safely concluded that application for renewal of permit shall be filed ***“before the date of its expiry”*** which means the application for renewal of permit



cannot be filed after expiry of permit which has been done in the present case. On conjoint reading of Sub-section (2) and (3) of Section 81 of M.V. Act, 1988, **it can be safely concluded that** in cases where the application for renewal of permit is made after fifteen days of specified date mentioned in sub-section (2) and before expiry of permit, same can be considered under Sub-section (3) if the transport authority is satisfied that the applicant was prevented by good and sufficient cause from making an application **within the time specified under Sub-Section (2)**. In no case application for renewal of permit can be entertained by STA after expiry of permit.

In this regard Hon'ble Supreme Court vide their judgment reported in AIR 1976 SC 2161 held that:

"7. xx xx xx The proviso to sub-section (2) requires that an application for renewal of a permit should be made not less than 120 days before the date of expiry of the permit. But, notwithstanding this provision, the Regional Transport Authority may, under sub-section (3), entertain an application for renewal of a permit after the last date specified in sub-section (2), "if the application is made not more than 15 days after said last date and is accompanied by the prescribed fee." Sub-section (3) thus vests a discretion in the Regional Transport Authority to entertain an application for renewal of a permit even if it is beyond time, but in that case the delay should not be of more than fifteen days. The word used in sub-section (3) is "may" and not "shall" and the Regional Transport Authority is given a discretion to entertain an application for renewal of a permit even where it is beyond time, though not more than 15 days. It may condone the delay or it may not, depending on the circumstances of each case. The discretion is to be exercised not on any arbitrary or fanciful grounds or whim or caprice of the Regional Transport Authority, but it is to be a judicial discretion. It is true that the criterion which is to guide the Regional Transport Authority in the exercise of its discretion is not articulated in sub-section (3), but it is implicit in every conferment of discretion on a judicial or quasi-judicial authority that the discretion is to be exercised in a judicial manner on well -settled legal principles. It would not be right to

⑧
24.8

attribute to the legislature an intention to confer unguided and unfettered discretion on the Regional Transport Authority which is a quasi judicial authority. The discretion is obviously to be exercised where sufficient cause for not making the application for renewal within time is made out by the applicant. This criterion can legitimately be imported from Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963 which contains an allied provision for condonation of delay where an application is made beyond time. It could never have been the intention of the Legislature that even where there is no sufficient cause for delay in making an application for renewal, the Regional Transport Authority should still be bound to entertain the application for renewal merely on the ground that the delay is of not more than 15 days. Sub-section (3) enacts a provision for condonation of delay in making an application for renewal and not a provision extending the time limit specified in the proviso to sub-section (2) in all cases as a matter of course. If the intention of the Legislature were that in every case delay of not more than 15 days in making an application for renewal should be condoned as of course, there was no need for a separate provision in sub-section (3), but the Legislature could have very well specified "one hundred and five days" instead of "one hundred and twenty days" in the proviso to sub-section (2)."

"8. It is, therefore, clear that sub-section (3) of Section 58 confers a discretion on the Regional Transport Authority to entertain an application for renewal when it is made beyond the time limit specified in the proviso to sub-section (2), but not more than 15 days late and the discretion is to be exercised in favour of entertaining the application for renewal when it is shown that there was sufficient cause for not making it in time. Now the question which arises is: does Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963 apply so as to empower the Regional Transport Authority, for sufficient cause, to entertain an application for renewal even where it is delayed by more than 15 days? Section 29, sub-section (2) of the Limitation Act, 1963 makes Section 5 applicable in the case of an application for renewal unless its applicability can be said to be expressly excluded by any provision of the Act. The only

248

provision of the Act sought to be pressed into service for this purpose was sub-section (3). Does sub-section (3) expressly exclude further extension of time under Section 5? If it does, then Section 5 cannot be availed of by the appellant for condonation of the delay. Sub-section (3) in so many terms says that the Regional Transport Authority may condone the delay in making of an application for renewal and entertain it on merits provided the delay is of not more than 15 days. This clearly means that if the application for renewal is beyond time by more than 15 days, the Regional Transport Authority shall not be entitled to entertain it, or in other words, it shall have no power to condone the delay. There is thus an express provision in sub-section (3) that delay in making an application for renewal shall be condonable only if it is of not more than 15 days and that expressly excludes the applicability of Section 5 in cases where an application for renewal is delayed by more than 15 days. This provision may seem harsh, but it has been deliberately and advisedly made because the question of renewal of a permit must obviously be decided before the expiration of the period of the permit and in view of the elaborate procedure set out in Section 57 for dealing with an application for renewal, a certain minimum period before the expiration of the period of the permit must be provided within which this procedure can be completed so that the renewal can, if at all, be granted well in time before the permit expires. If an application for renewal could be entertained even if made at any stage, it would dislocate the procedural machinery set out in Section 57 and that is why the Legislature prescribed in sub-section (3) of section 58 that the delay in making an application for renewal may be condoned by the Regional Transport Authority only if it is of not more than 15 days. Here, the application made by the appellant for renewal of his permit was admittedly late by more than 15 days and hence the delay was not condonable and the Regional Transport Authority was right in rejecting the application for renewal as time barred."

Section 81 (3) of M.V Act, 1988 provides that the STA may entertain an application for renewal of permanent permit which was filed after the last date


24.8

specified in sub-section (2) of Section 81 i.e. less than 15 days **before expiry of permit and not after expiry of permit.**

Considering facts and circumstances mentioned above, after due deliberation, STA decided to reject application for renewal of permanent permit applied by Sri Purna Chandra Das owner of vehicle No.OD12B-2142 filed seven months after expiry of permanent permit in the ratio of decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court (supra) which is in aid and consonance of Section 81 (2) and (3) M.V. Act, 1988 and rules made there under. Application for renewal of permanent permit is rejected. It was decided to notify the route in the website inviting applications for grant of permanent permit in the interest of commuting public.

ITEM NO.5.2:-CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATION FOR GRANT OF RENEWAL OF PERMANENT PERMIT BEARING NO-PP99/170846/G IN THE ROUTE CUTTACK TO GOPALPUR VIA BHUBANESWAR, BERHAMPUR AND BACK IN RESPECT OF VEHICLE NO- OD02BA-5657 IN FAVOUR OF SRI SUSIM KANTI MOHANTY .

Applicant is present in person. Heard through video conference.

He submitted that permanent permit may be renewed in respect of his vehicle no.OD02BA-5657.

Permanent Permit **PP99/170846/G** on the route **Cuttack to Gopalpur VIA Bhubaneswar, Berhampur and back** has been granted in favour of **Sri Susim Kanti Mohanty** owner of vehicle no.OD02BA-5657 valid till 11.10.2022 w.e.f. 12.10.2017. Sri Mohanty has filed application for renewal of permanent permit on 20.04.2023 i.e. 06 months after expiry of permit.

Show cause filed by **Sri Susim Kanti Mohanty** has been considered. Under the statute, the STA has no power to renew the permanent permit in cases where the application for renewal of permit was filed after expiry of permit.

Section 81 (2) & (3) of M.V. Act, 1988 are quoted below for better appreciation.

"(2) A permit may be renewed on an application made not less than fifteen days before the date of its expiry.




(3) Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (2), the Regional Transport Authority or the State Transport Authority, as the case may be, **may entertain an application for the renewal of a permit after the last date specified in that sub-section** if it is satisfied that the applicant was prevented by goods and sufficient cause from making an application within the time specified."

On plain reading of provisions contained under Section 81 (2) of M.V. Act, 1988, it can be safely concluded that application for renewal of permit shall be filed **"before the date of its expiry"** which means the application for renewal of permit cannot be filed after expiry of permit which has been done in the present case. On conjoint reading of Sub-section (2) and (3) of Section 81 of M.V. Act, 1988, **it can be safely concluded that** in cases where the application for renewal of permit is made after fifteen days of specified date mentioned in sub-section (2) and before expiry of permit, same can be considered under Sub-section (3) if the transport authority is satisfied that the applicant was prevented by good and sufficient cause from making an application **within the time specified under Sub-Section (2)**. In no case application for renewal of permit can be entertained by STA after expiry of permit.

In this regard Hon'ble Supreme Court vide their judgment reported in AIR 1976 SC 2161 held that:

"7. xx xx xx The proviso to sub-section (2) requires that an application for renewal of a permit should be made not less than 120 days before the date of expiry of the permit. But, notwithstanding this provision, the Regional Transport Authority may, under sub-section (3), entertain an application for renewal of a permit after the last date specified in sub-section (2), "if the application is made not more than 15 days after said last date and is accompanied by the prescribed fee." Sub-section (3) thus vests a discretion in the Regional Transport Authority to entertain an application for renewal of a permit even if it is beyond time, but in that case the delay should not be of more than fifteen days. The word used in sub-section (3) is "may" and not "shall" and the Regional Transport Authority is given a discretion to entertain

A handwritten signature in a circle, followed by the date 24.8.

an application for renewal of a permit even where it is beyond time, though not more than 15 days. It may condone the delay or it may not, depending on the circumstances of each case. The discretion is to be exercised not on any arbitrary or fanciful grounds or whim or caprice of the Regional Transport Authority, but it is to be a judicial discretion. It is true that the criterion which is to guide the Regional Transport Authority in the exercise of its discretion is not articulated in sub-section (3), but it is implicit in every conferment of discretion on a judicial or quasi-judicial authority that the discretion is to be exercised in a judicial manner on well-settled legal principles. It would not be right to attribute to the legislature an intention to confer unguided and unfettered discretion on the Regional Transport Authority which is a quasi judicial authority. The discretion is obviously to be exercised where sufficient cause for not making the application for renewal within time is made out by the applicant. This criterion can legitimately be imported from Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963 which contains an allied provision for condonation of delay where an application is made beyond time. It could never have been the intention of the Legislature that even where there is no sufficient cause for delay in making an application for renewal, the Regional Transport Authority should still be bound to entertain the application for renewal merely on the ground that the delay is of not more than 15 days. Sub-section (3) enacts a provision for condonation of delay in making an application for renewal and not a provision extending the time limit specified in the proviso to sub-section (2) in all cases as a matter of course. If the intention of the Legislature were that in every case delay of not more than 15 days in making an application for renewal should be condoned as of course, there was no need for a separate provision in sub-section (3), but the Legislature could have very well specified "one hundred and five days" instead of "one hundred and twenty days" in the proviso to sub-section (2)."

"8. It is, therefore, clear that sub-section (3) of Section 58 confers a discretion on the Regional Transport Authority to entertain an application for renewal when it is made beyond the time limit specified in the proviso to sub-



section (2), but not more than 15 days late and the discretion is to be exercised in favour of entertaining the application for renewal when it is shown that there was sufficient cause for not making it in time. Now the question which arises is: does Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963 apply so as to empower the Regional Transport Authority, for sufficient cause, to entertain an application for renewal even where it is delayed by more than 15 days? Section 29,, sub-section (2) of the Limitation Act, 1963 makes Section 5 applicable in the case of an application for renewal unless its applicability can be said to be expressly excluded by any provision of the Act. The only provision of the Act sought to be pressed into service for this purpose was sub-section (3). Does sub-section (3) expressly exclude further extension of time under Section 5? If it does, then Section 5 cannot be availed of any the appellant for condonation of the delay. Sub-section (3) in so many terms says that the Regional Transport Authority may condone the delay in making of an application for renewal and entertain it on merits provided the delay is of not more than 15 days. This clearly means that if the application for renewal is beyond time by more than 15 days, the Regional Transport Authority shall not be entitled to entertain it, or in other words, it shall have no power to condone the delay. There is thus an express provision in sub-section (3) that delay in making an application for renewal shall be condonable only if it is of not more than 15 days and that expressly excludes the applicability of Section 5 in cases where an application for renewal is delayed by more than 15 days. This provision may seem harsh, but it has been deliberately and advisedly made because the question of renewal of a permit must obviously be decided before the expiration of the period of the permit and in view of the elaborate procedure set out in Section 57 for dealing with an application for renewal, a certain minimum period before the expiration of the period of the permit must be provided within which this procedure can be completed so that the renewal can, if at all, be granted well in time before the permit expires. If an application for renewal could be entertained even if made at any stage, it would dislocate the procedural machinery set out in Section 57 and that is why the Legislature

A handwritten signature and the initials '24-8' are located in the bottom right corner of the page.

prescribed in sub-section (3) of section 58 that the delay in making an application for renewal may be condoned by the Regional Transport Authority only if it is of not more than 15 days. Here, the application made by the appellant for renewal of his permit was admittedly late by more than 15 days and hence the delay was not condonable and the Regional Transport Authority was right in rejecting the application for renewal as time barred."

Section 81 (3) of M.V Act, 1988 provides that the STA may entertain an application for renewal of permanent permit which was filed after the last date specified in sub-section (2) of Section 81 i.e. less than 15 days **before expiry of permit and not after expiry of permit.**

Considering facts and circumstances mentioned above, after due deliberation, STA decided to reject application for renewal of permanent permit filed by **Sri Susim Kanti Mohanty** six months after expiry of permanent permit in the ratio of decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court (supra) which is in aid and consonance of Section 81 (2) and (3) M.V. Act, 1988 and rules made there under. Application for renewal of permanent permit is rejected. It was decided to notify the route in the website inviting applications for grant of permanent permit in the interest of commuting public.

ITEM NO.5.3:- RECONSIDERATION OF OFFICE ORDER NO-14681/TC DATED-21.10.2022 IN FAVOUR OF SRI PRASANTA KUMAR JENA OWNER OF VEHICLE NO-OD04G-8684 ON THE ROUTE FROM RAJKANIKA TO BHUBANESWAR AND BACK.

Adv. Sri H.P Mohanty on behalf Sri Prasant Kumar Jena.

Adv. S. Mishra on behalf of Sandeep Dwivedi has an objection.

Adv. P.K. Behera on behalf of Smt Jayanti Behera has an objection.

Adv. R. Acharya on behalf of Cuttack Bus association has an objection.

Permanent Permit No- **SC/SIRP99/01278/2020** was granted to **Sri Prasanta Kumar Jena** in respect of vehicle no. **OD04G-8684** on the route **Rajkanika to Bhubaneswar and back** which is valid till 06.06.2025 with down trip timing slot no-09 with Pattamundai Dep.03:58 towards Bhubaneswar and UP trip timing and slot No-97 with Cuttack Dep. 12:16 towards Rajkanika Via- Pattamundai in category-A.



Sri Jena has applied for change of timing from category-A to category-B with slot no-27 category-B with Deptt. Pattamundai at 06:19 towards Bhubaneswar in down trip instead of slot no-9 with Pattamundai dep. 03:58 and his application was considered.

The Cuttack Private Bus owners association filed objection on the ground that down trip slot no-27 with Pattamundai dep.06:19 has already been allotted to the vehicle no-OD05AA-3733 plying on the route Ostarahat to Anugul Via- Kendrapara, Salipur and back and permanent permit valid till 21.10.2027. On the basis of said objection revised timing granted to vehicle OD04G-8684 was cancelled and the permit holder was allowed to operate his vehicle OD04G-8684 in previous slot no-09 in down trip and slot no-97 in Up trip.

Report was called for from the Project Director NHAI, Bhubaneswar vide this office letter no-981/TC dated 19.01.2023 regarding operational status of vehicle no-OD05AA-3733 through NHAI toll gate at Pundal and Srirampur for the period from 01.11.2021 to 30.11.2022. In response to the above letter, Project Director, NHAI, Bhubaneswar vide their letter no-387 dt-02.03.2023 has intimated that the vehicle no-OD05AA-3733 has not passed through the project toll plaza at Bandala from 01.11.2021 to 30.11.2022. It was thus established that the permit holder Jubula Kumar Jethy, owner of vehicle OD05AA-3733 did not operate his vehicle from Ostrahat to Cuttack via Kendrapara, Salipur violating permit conditions and thereby caused inconvenience to the travelling public. Show cause notice was issued to Sri Jubula Kumar Jethy owner of vehicle no- OD05AA-3733 vide letter no-5860/TC dated-18.04.2023 as to why his PP shall not be cancelled / Suspended for violation of permit conditions U/S 86 of M.V. Act, 1988 for non operation of his vehicle on the route from Ostrahat to Cuttack. In response to show cause notice, Sri Jethy has filed reply stating that due to bad road condition from Cuttack to Angul he could not catch the allotted slot time to operate from Ostrahat to Cuttack.

It is not disputed that the vehicle of Sri Jethy has not operated from Ostrahat to Cuttack from 07.06.2020 onwards i.e. more than three years causing inconvenience to travelling public. The permit holder also did not intimate the STA

A handwritten signature in a circle, followed by the date 24.8.

about non-operation of bus from 07.06.2020 onwards as required under rule 75 (3) of OMV Rules, 1993.

The permit holder failed to provide service to the commuting public from Ostrahat to Cuttack since 07.06.2020 onwards i.e. more than three years from the date of issue of permit for which travelling public suffered a lot. It was resolved to cancel the permanent permit No.PP99/170874/G granted to Sri Jubula Kumar Jethy owner of vehicle No.OD05AA-3733 for non-operation of service in the given route causing inconvenience to the travelling public. The route be notified in the news paper inviting application for grant of permanent permit to deserving bus operators.

The application of Sri Prasant Kumar Jena to reconsider the office order No.1468/TC dated 21.10.22 is also rejected.

ITEM NO.5.4:-CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATION FOR GRANT OF RENEWAL OF PERMANENT PERMIT BEARING NO-PP99/130376/G IN THE ROUTE MUKHIGUDA TO BERHAMPUR VIA- BHAWANIPATNA, BALIGUDA, BHANJANAGAR AND BACK IN RESPECT OF VEHICLE NO- OR07AB-9181 IN FAVOUR OF SRI SUBASH CHANDRA PATTNAIK .

Applicant is present in person. Heard through video conference.

Permanent Permit PP99/130376/G on the route Mukhiguda to Berhampur Via- Bhawanipatna, Baliguda, Bhanjanagar and back has been granted in favour of Sri Subash Chandra Pattnaik owner of vehicle No.OR07AB-9181 valid till-30.04.2023. Sri Pattnaik has filed application for renewal of permit on 18.06.2023 i.e. after one month and eighteen days of expiry of permit.

From VAHAN it reveals that the vehicle No.OR07AB-9181 was kept off road from 01.10.2018 to 31.10.2018 (one month), 01.08.2019 to 30.09.2019 (two months), 01.02.2022 to 31.07.2022 (six months), 01.12.2022 to 28.02.2023 (three months) and 01.04.2023 to 30.04.2023 (one month) during validity of permit excluding covid period.

Total period of off road of vehicle of Sri Pattnaik was one year and one month. The STA in 291st meeting held on 19.02.2020 resolved the following.

"1.2 RENEWAL / CANCELLATION OF STAGE CARRIAGE PERMIT.

It was brought to the notice of STA that after availing permanent stage carriage permit, some of the permit holders are (1) not operating the bus in the given route and timing, (2) kept the vehicle off road for more than one year causing disruption of service which is detrimental to commuting public and (3) not paying tax due.

In order to prevent such type of non-operation of bus services and keeping in view interest of travelling public, it was resolved that:

(i) Where the vehicle for which permanent stage carriage permit was issued in a route / routes had been declared off road for a period of one year during currency of permit in different spells, renewal of such permit shall not be considered. Besides steps will also be taken for cancellation of permit before its expiry under Section 86 of M.V. Act, 1988. The permit holder will furnish / upload self-declaration in **Annexure-C** at the time of making application for renewal of permit."

It is not disputed that his vehicle was under off road and did not operate in the given route for more than one year causing inconvenience to travelling public. The permit holder also did not intimate the STA about non-operation of bus for more than one year as required under rule 75 (3) of OMV Rules, 1993.

Under the statute, it is the STA to look after the convenience of travelling public commuting from Mukhiguda to Berhampur Via- Bhawanipatna, Baliguda, Bhanjanagar and back for which permit was granted to petitioner considering volume of traffic in the said route. Non-plying of bus by the petitioner for more than one year is bound to cause inconvenience to travelling public. The commuting public had suffered a lot due to non-operation of bus. For such deficiency in providing service to public by the petitioner, his conduct as stage carriage operator is found to be not satisfactory.

The permit holder did not operate his vehicle for more than one year without intimating the fact of non-operation of his vehicle to STA violating permit conditions for which the permit is liable to be cancelled under Section 86 (1) (a) of M.V. Act, 1988. The members of STA, after due deliberation, are of the view that the permit

A handwritten signature, possibly 'S. B.', is written above the number '248'.

holder has failed to operate the bus in the given route for more than one year and thereby violated permit condition. Decision of STA to cancel the permit due to non operation is squarely applicable to the present case.

Show cause filed by Sri Subash Chandra Pattnaik has been considered. Under the statute, the STA has no power to renew the permanent permit in cases where the application for renewal of permit was filed after expiry of permit.

Section 81 (2) & (3) of M.V. Act, 1988 are quoted below for better appreciation.

"(2) A permit may be renewed on an application made not less than fifteen days before the date of its expiry.

(3) Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (2), the Regional Transport Authority or the State Transport Authority, as the case may be, may entertain an application for the renewal of a permit after the last date specified in that sub-section if it is satisfied that the applicant was prevented by goods and sufficient cause from making an application within the time specified."

On plain reading of provisions contained under Section 81 (2) of M.V. Act, 1988, it can be safely concluded that application for renewal of permit shall be filed ***"before the date of its expiry"*** which means the application for renewal of permit cannot be filed after expiry of permit which has been done in the present case. On conjoint reading of Sub-section (2) and (3) of Section 81 of M.V. Act, 1988, ***it can be safely concluded that*** in cases where the application for renewal of permit is made after fifteen days of specified date mentioned in sub-section (2) and before expiry of permit, same can be considered under Sub-section (3) if the transport authority is satisfied that the applicant was prevented by good and sufficient cause from making an application ***within the time specified under Sub-Section (2).*** In no case application for renewal of permit can be entertained by STA after expiry of permit.

In this regard Hon'ble Supreme Court vide their judgment reported in AIR 1976 SC 2161 held that:



"7. xx xx xx The proviso to sub-section (2) requires that an application for renewal of a permit should be made not less than 120 days before the date of expiry of the permit. But, notwithstanding this provision, the Regional Transport Authority may, under sub-section (3), entertain an application for renewal of a permit after the last date specified in sub-section (2), "if the application is made not more than 15 days after said last date and is accompanied by the prescribed fee." Sub-section (3) thus vests a discretion in the Regional Transport Authority to entertain an application for renewal of a permit even if it is beyond time, but in that case the delay should not be of more than fifteen days. The word used in sub-section (3) is "may" and not "shall" and the Regional Transport Authority is given a discretion to entertain an application for renewal of a permit even where it is beyond time, though not more than 15 days. It may condone the delay or it may not, depending on the circumstances of each case. The discretion is to be exercised not on any arbitrary or fanciful grounds or whim or caprice of the Regional Transport Authority, but it is to be a judicial discretion. It is true that the criterion which is to guide the Regional Transport Authority in the exercise of its discretion is not articulated in sub-section (3), but it is implicit in every conferment of discretion on a judicial or quasi-judicial authority that the discretion is to be exercised in a judicial manner on well -settled legal principles. It would not be right to attribute to the legislature an intention to confer unguided and unfettered discretion on the Regional Transport Authority which is a quasi judicial authority. The discretion is obviously to be exercised where sufficient cause for not making the application for renewal within time is made out by the applicant. This criterion can legitimately be imported from Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963 which contains an allied provision for condonation of delay where an application is made beyond time. It could never have been the intention of the Legislature that even where there is no sufficient cause for delay in making an application for renewal, the Regional Transport Authority should still be bound to entertain the application for renewal merely on the ground that the delay is of not more than 15 days. Sub-section (3) enacts a

24.8

provision for condonation of delay in making an application for renewal and not a provision extending the time limit specified in the proviso to sub-section (2) in all cases as a matter of course. If the intention of the Legislature were that in every case delay of not more than 15 days in making an application for renewal should be condoned as of course, there was no need for a separate provision in sub-section (3), but the Legislature could have very well specified "one hundred and five days" instead of "one hundred and twenty days" in the proviso to sub-section (2)."

"8. It is, therefore, clear that sub-section (3) of Section 58 confers a discretion on the Regional Transport Authority to entertain an application for renewal when it is made beyond the time limit specified in the proviso to sub-section (2), but not more than 15 days late and the discretion is to be exercised in favour of entertaining the application for renewal when it is shown that there was sufficient cause for not making it in time. Now the question which arises is: does Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963 apply so as to empower the Regional Transport Authority, for sufficient cause, to entertain an application for renewal even where it is delayed by more than 15 days? Section 29,, sub-section (2) of the Limitation Act, 1963 makes Section 5 applicable in the case of an application for renewal unless its applicability can be said to be expressly excluded by any provision of the Act. The only provision of the Act sought to be pressed into service for this purpose was sub-section (3). Does sub-section (3) expressly exclude further extension of time under Section 5? If it does, then Section 5 cannot be availed of any the appellant for condonation of the delay. Sub-section (3) in so many terms says that the Regional Transport Authority may condone the delay in making of an application for renewal and entertain it on merits provided the delay is of not more than 15 days. This clearly means that if the application for renewal is beyond time by more than 15 days, the Regional Transport Authority shall not be entitled to entertain it, or in other words, it shall have no power to condone the delay. There is thus an express provision in sub-section (3) that delay in making an application for renewal shall be condonable only if it is of not more

A handwritten signature and initials, possibly "S. 248", are written in the bottom right corner of the page.

than 15 days and that expressly excludes the applicability of Section 5 in cases where an application for renewal is delayed by more than 15 days. This provision may seem harsh, but it has been deliberately and advisedly made because the question of renewal of a permit must obviously be decided before the expiration of the period of the permit and in view of the elaborate procedure set out in Section 57 for dealing with an application for renewal, a certain minimum period before the expiration of the period of the permit must be provided within which this procedure can be completed so that the renewal can, if at all, be granted well in time before the permit expires. If an application for renewal could be entertained even if made at any stage, it would dislocate the procedural machinery set out in Section 57 and that is why the Legislature prescribed in sub-section (3) of section 58 that the delay in making an application for renewal may be condoned by the Regional Transport Authority only if it is of not more than 15 days. Here, the application made by the appellant for renewal of his permit was admittedly late by more than 15 days and hence the delay was not condonable and the Regional Transport Authority was right in rejecting the application for renewal as time barred."

Section 81 (3) of M.V Act, 1988 provides that the STA may entertain an application for renewal of permanent permit which was filed after the last date specified in sub-section (2) of Section 81 i.e. less than 15 days **before expiry of permit and not after expiry of permit.**

It is not disputed that his vehicle was under off road did not operate in the given route for one year and one month causing inconvenience to travelling public. The permit holder also did not intimate the STA about non-operation of bus as required under rule 75 (3) of OMV Rules, 1993.

Considering facts and circumstances mentioned above, after due deliberation, STA decided to reject application for renewal of permanent permit filed by Sri Subash Chandra Pattnaik after expiry of permanent permit in the ratio of decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court (supra) which is in aid and consonance of Section 81 (2) and (3) M.V. Act, 1988 and rules made there under and in view of the fact that the vehicle was



under off road for one year and one month and not operating during the validity of permit. Application for renewal of permanent permit is rejected. It was decided to notify the route in the website inviting applications for grant of permanent permit in the interest of commuting public.

ITEM NO.5.5:-CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATION FOR REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING VEHICLE NO-OD05U-2227 BY HIGHER MODEL VEHICLE NO-OD05AG2227 ON THE ROUTE ROURKELA TO PURI VIA-KAMAKHYANAGAR AND BACK IN FAVOUR OF SRI GAJENDRA KUMAR NAYAK .

Advocate Sri S. Mishra is appeared on behalf of Sri Gajendra Kumar Nayak owner of vehicle no-OD05U-2227.Heard.

Permanent Permit vide Permit No.PP99/150476/G on the route Rourkela to Puri Via- Kamakhyanagar and back has been granted in favor of Sri Gajendra Kumar Nayak owner of vehicle no.OD05U-2227 valid till 28.09.2025. Sri Nayak has filed application for replacement of vehicle on 28.06.2023.

From VAHAN it reveals that the vehicle No.OD05U-2227 was kept off road from 01.11.2021 to 28.02.2022 (four months) and 01.06.2022 to 30.06.2023 (one year and three months) during validity of permit excluding Covid grace period.

Total period of off road of vehicle of Sri Nayak was one year and three months.

The STA in 291st meeting held on 19.02.2020 resolved the following.

"1.2 RENEWAL / CANCELLATION OF STAGE CARRIAGE PERMIT.

It was brought to the notice of STA that after availing permanent stage carriage permit, some of the permit holders are (1) not operating the bus in the given route and timing, (2) kept the vehicle off road for more than one year causing disruption of service which is detrimental to commuting public and (3) not paying tax due.

In order to prevent such type of non-operation of bus services and keeping in view interest of travelling public, it was resolved that:

A handwritten signature and the initials '248' are present in the bottom right corner of the page.

(i) Where the vehicle for which permanent stage carriage permit was issued in a route / routes had been declared off road for a period of one year during currency of permit in different spells, renewal of such permit shall not be considered. Besides steps will also be taken for cancellation of permit before its expiry under Section 86 of M.V. Act, 1988. The permit holder will furnish / upload self-declaration in **Annexure-C** at the time of making application for renewal of permit."

It is not disputed that his vehicle was under off road did not operate in the given route for one year and three months causing inconvenience to travelling public. The permit holder also did not intimate the STA about non-operation of bus as required under rule 75 (3) of OMV Rules, 1993.

Under the statute, it is the STA to look after the convenience of travelling public commuting from **Rourkela to Puri Via- Kamakhyanagar and back** for which permit was granted to petitioner considering volume of traffic in the said route. Non-plying of bus by the petitioner for more than one year is bound to cause inconvenience to travelling public. The commuting public had suffered a lot due to non-operation of bus by the petitioner for one year and three months. For such deficiency in providing service to public by the petitioner, his conduct as stage carriage operator is found to be not satisfactory.

The permit holder did not operate his vehicle for one year and three months without intimating the fact of non-operation of his vehicle to STA violating permit conditions for which the permit is liable to be cancelled under Section 86 (1) (a) of M.V. Act, 1988. The members of STA, after due deliberation, are of the view that the permit holder has failed to operate the bus in the given route for more than one year and thereby violated permit condition. Decision of STA to cancel the permit due to non operation is squarely applicable to the present case.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, provisions of law and decision taken by STA in 264th and 291st meetings, in exercise of powers under Section 86 (1) (a) of M.V. Act, 1988, it was resolved to reject application for replacement of vehicle issued to **Sri Gajendra Kumar Nayak**, owner of vehicle no.OD05U-2227 in the route **Rourkela to Puri Via- Kamakhyanagar and back** for

violating permit conditions. Application for replacement of vehicle is rejected. It was resolved that the route be notified in website of STA inviting applications for grant of permanent permit from deserving stage carriage operator.

ITEM NO.5.6:-CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATION FOR RENEWAL WITH REPLACEMENT OF VEHICLE NO-OR14E-5380 BY HIGHER MODEL VEHICLE NO-OD14AC-6346 IN FAVOUR OF SRI ANJAN KUMAR PRADHAN ON THE ROUTE FROM NTPC TO SARASARA VIA-SAMAL, PALLAHARA, BARKOTE AND BACK.

Heard Sri H.P. Mohanty, Advocate appeared on behalf of Sri Anjan Kumar Pradhan. He submitted that decision may be taken taking into consideration show cause filed by the permit holder.

Permanent Permit PP99/130394/G on the route NTPC to Sarasara VIA- Samal, Pallahara, Barkote and back has been granted in favour of Sri Anjan Kumar Pradhan owner of vehicle no. OR14E-5380 valid till 06.05.2023 w.e.f. 07.05.2018. Sri Pradhan has filed application for renewal and replacement of vehicle on 09.06.2023 i.e. after one month and three days of expiry of permit.

From VAHAN it reveals that the vehicle No. OR14E-5380 was kept off road from 01.11.2021 to 31.05.2023 (one year and seven months) excluding Covid – 19 period.

The STA in 291st meeting held on 19.02.2020 resolved the following.

“1.2 RENEWAL / CANCELLATION OF STAGE CARRIAGE PERMIT.

It was brought to the notice of STA that after availing permanent stage carriage permit, some of the permit holders are (1) not operating the bus in the given route and timing, (2) kept the vehicle off road for more than one year causing disruption of service which is detrimental to commuting public and (3) not paying tax due.

In order to prevent such type of non-operation of bus services and keeping in view interest of travelling public, it was resolved that:

- (i) Where the vehicle for which permanent stage carriage permit was issued in a route / routes had been declared off road for a period of one year during



currency of permit in different spells, renewal of such permit shall not be considered. Besides steps will also be taken for cancellation of permit before its expiry under Section 86 of M.V. Act, 1988. The permit holder will furnish / upload self-declaration in **Annexure-C** at the time of making application for renewal of permit."

It is not disputed that his vehicle was under off road did not operate in the given route from 01.11.2021 to 31.05.2023 i.e. more than one year causing inconvenience to travelling public. The permit holder also did not intimate the STA about non-operation of bus from 01.11.2021 to 31.05.2023 as required under rule 75 (3) of OMV Rules, 1993.

Under the statute, it is the STA to look after the convenience of travelling public commuting from **NTPC to Sarasara VIA- Samal, Pallahara, Barkote and back** for which permit was grated to petitioner considering volume of traffic in the said route. Non-plying of bus by the petitioner for more than one year is bound to cause inconvenience to travelling public. The commuting public had suffered a lot due to non-operation of bus by the petitioner from 01.11.2021 to 31.05.2023. For such deficiency in providing service to public by the petitioner, his conduct as stage carriage operator is found to be not satisfactory.

Show cause filed by **Sri Anjan Kumar Pradhan** has been considered. Under the statute, the STA has no power to renew the permanent permit in cases where the application for renewal of permit was filed after expiry of permit.

Section 81 (2) & (3) of M.V. Act, 1988 are quoted below for better appreciation.

"(2) A permit may be renewed on an application made not less than fifteen days before the date of its expiry.

(3) Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (2), the Regional Transport Authority or the State Transport Authority, as the case may be, may entertain an application for the renewal of a permit after the last date specified in that sub-section if it is satisfied that the applicant was prevented by goods and sufficient cause from making an application within the time specified."



On plain reading of provisions contained under Section 81 (2) of M.V. Act, 1988, it can be safely concluded that application for renewal of permit shall be filed "**before the date of its expiry**" which means the application for renewal of permit cannot be filed after expiry of permit which has been done in the present case. On conjoint reading of Sub-section (2) and (3) of Section 81 of M.V. Act, 1988, **it can be safely concluded that** in cases where the application for renewal of permit is made after fifteen days of specified date mentioned in sub-section (2) and before expiry of permit, same can be considered under Sub-section (3) if the transport authority is satisfied that the applicant was prevented by good and sufficient cause from making an application **within the time specified under Sub-Section (2)**. In no case application for renewal of permit can be entertained by STA after expiry of permit.

In this regard Hon'ble Supreme Court vide their judgment reported in AIR 1976 SC 2161 held that:

"7. xx xx xx The proviso to sub-section (2) requires that an application for renewal of a permit should be made not less than 120 days before the date of expiry of the permit. But, notwithstanding this provision, the Regional Transport Authority may, under sub-section (3), entertain an application for renewal of a permit after the last date specified in sub-section (2), "if the application is made not more than 15 days after said last date and is accompanied by the prescribed fee." Sub-section (3) thus vests a discretion in the Regional Transport Authority to entertain an application for renewal of a permit even if it is beyond time, but in that case the delay should not be of more than fifteen days. The word used in sub-section (3) is "may" and not "shall" and the Regional Transport Authority is given a discretion to entertain an application for renewal of a permit even where it is beyond time, though not more than 15 days. It may condone the delay or it may not, depending on the circumstances of each case. The discretion is to be exercised not on any arbitrary or fanciful grounds or whim or caprice of the Regional Transport Authority, but it is to be a judicial discretion. It is true that the criterion which is to guide the Regional Transport Authority in the exercise of its discretion is not



articulated in sub-section (3), but it is implicit in every conferment of discretion on a judicial or quasi-judicial authority that the discretion is to be exercised in a judicial manner on well –settled legal principles. It would not be right to attribute to the legislature an intention to confer unguided and unfettered discretion on the Regional Transport Authority which is a quasi judicial authority. The discretion is obviously to be exercised where sufficient cause for not making the application for renewal within time is made out by the applicant. This criterion can legitimately be imported from Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963 which contains an allied provision for condonation of delay where an application is made beyond time. It could never have been the intention of the Legislature that even where there is no sufficient cause for delay in making an application for renewal, the Regional Transport Authority should still be bound to entertain the application for renewal merely on the ground that the delay is of not more than 15 days. Sub-section (3) enacts a provision for condonation of delay in making an application for renewal and not a provision extending the time limit specified in the proviso to sub-section (2) in all cases as a matter of course. If the intention of the Legislature were that in every case delay of not more than 15 days in making an application for renewal should be condoned as of course, there was no need for a separate provision in sub-section (3), but the Legislature could have very well specified "one hundred and five days" instead of "one hundred and twenty days" in the proviso to sub-section (2)."

"8. It is, therefore, clear that sub-section (3) of Section 58 confers a discretion on the Regional Transport Authority to entertain an application for renewal when it is made beyond the time limit specified in the proviso to sub-section (2), but not more than 15 days late and the discretion is to be exercised in favour of entertaining the application for renewal when it is shown that there was sufficient cause for not making it in time. Now the question which arises is: does Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963 apply so as to empower the Regional Transport Authority, for sufficient cause, to entertain an application for renewal even where it is delayed by more than 15 days?



Section 29,, sub-section (2) of the Limitation Act, 1963 makes Section 5 applicable in the case of an application for renewal unless its applicability can be said to be expressly excluded by any provision of the Act. The only provision of the Act sought to be pressed into service for this purpose was sub-section (3). Does sub-section (3) expressly exclude further extension of time under Section 5? If it does, then Section 5 cannot be availed of by the appellant for condonation of the delay. Sub-section (3) in so many terms says that the Regional Transport Authority may condone the delay in making of an application for renewal and entertain it on merits provided the delay is of not more than 15 days. This clearly means that if the application for renewal is beyond time by more than 15 days, the Regional Transport Authority shall not be entitled to entertain it, or in other words, it shall have no power to condone the delay. There is thus an express provision in sub-section (3) that delay in making an application for renewal shall be condonable only if it is of not more than 15 days and that expressly excludes the applicability of Section 5 in cases where an application for renewal is delayed by more than 15 days. This provision may seem harsh, but it has been deliberately and advisedly made because the question of renewal of a permit must obviously be decided before the expiration of the period of the permit and in view of the elaborate procedure set out in Section 57 for dealing with an application for renewal, a certain minimum period before the expiration of the period of the permit must be provided within which this procedure can be completed so that the renewal can, if at all, be granted well in time before the permit expires. If an application for renewal could be entertained even if made at any stage, it would dislocate the procedural machinery set out in Section 57 and that is why the Legislature prescribed in sub-section (3) of section 58 that the delay in making an application for renewal may be condoned by the Regional Transport Authority only if it is of not more than 15 days. Here, the application made by the appellant for renewal of his permit was admittedly late by more than 15 days and hence the delay was not condonable and the Regional Transport Authority was right in rejecting the application for renewal as time barred."



Section 81 (3) of M.V Act, 1988 provides that the STA may entertain an application for renewal of permanent permit which was filed after the last date specified in sub-section (2) of Section 81 i.e. less than 15 days **before expiry of permit and not after expiry of permit.**

It is not disputed that his vehicle was under off road did not operate in the given route from 01.11.2021 to 31.05.2023 i.e. more than one year causing inconvenience to travelling public. The permit holder also did not intimate the STA about non-operation of bus from 01.11.2021 to 31.05.2023 as required under rule 75 (3) of OMV Rules, 1993.

Considering facts and circumstances mentioned above, after due deliberation, STA decided to reject application for renewal of permanent permit filed by **Sri Anjan Kumar Pradhan** owner of vehicle no. **OR14E-5380** after expiry of permanent permit in the ratio of decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court (supra) which is in aid and consonance of Section 81 (2) and (3) M.V. Act, 1988 and rules made thereunder and in view of the fact that the vehicle was under off road for one year and seven months and not operating during the validity of permit. Application for renewal of permanent permit and replacement of vehicle are rejected. It was decided to notify the route in the website inviting applications for grant of permanent permit in the interest of commuting public.

ITEM NO.5.7:-CANCELLATION OF PERMANENT PERMIT BEARING NO-PP99/170216/G ON THE ROUTE CUTTACK TO PARADEEP 3RT IN RESPECT OF VEHICLE OR05Z-3279 IN FAVOUR OF SRI SAROJ KUMAR JENA.

Heard Sri A.K. Behera, Advocate on behalf of Sri Saroj Kumar Jena. He submitted that decision may be taken taking into consideration show cause filed by the permit holder.

Permanent Permit **PP99/170216/G** on the route Cuttack to Paradeep and back has been granted in favour of Sri Saroj Kumar Jena owner of vehicle no. **OR05Z-3279** valid till 29.03.2022 w.e.f. 30.03.2017. Sri Jena has filed application for renewal and replacement of vehicle on 22.04.2022 i.e. after expiry of permit.



From VAHAN it reveals that the vehicle No. OR05Z-3279 was kept off road from 01.08.2018 to 31.12.2018 (five months) and 01.01.2019 to 31.12.2019 (one year) during valid of permit excluding Covid – 19 period.

Total period of off road of vehicle of Sri Saroj Kumar Jena was one year and five months.

The STA in 291st meeting held on 19.02.2020 resolved the following.

“1.2 RENEWAL / CANCELLATION OF STAGE CARRIAGE PERMIT.

It was brought to the notice of STA that after availing permanent stage carriage permit, some of the permit holders are (1) not operating the bus in the given route and timing, (2) kept the vehicle off road for more than one year causing disruption of service which is detrimental to commuting public and (3) not paying tax due.

In order to prevent such type of non-operation of bus services and keeping in view interest of travelling public, it was resolved that:

(i) Where the vehicle for which permanent stage carriage permit was issued in a route / routes had been declared off road for a period of one year during currency of permit in different spells, renewal of such permit shall not be considered. Besides steps will also be taken for cancellation of permit before its expiry under Section 86 of M.V. Act, 1988. The permit holder will furnish / upload self-declaration in **Annexure-C** at the time of making application for renewal of permit.”

It is not disputed that his vehicle was under off road did not operate in the given route for more than one year causing inconvenience to travelling public. The permit holder also did not intimate the STA about non-operation of bus as required under rule 75 (3) of OMV Rules, 1993.

Under the statute, it is the STA to look after the convenience of travelling public commuting from Cuttack to Paradeep and back for which permit was granted to petitioner considering volume of traffic in the said route. Non-plying of bus by the petitioner for more than one year is bound to cause inconvenience to travelling public. The commuting public had suffered a lot due to non-operation of bus. For



such deficiency in providing service to public by the petitioner, his conduct as stage carriage operator found to be not satisfactory.

Show cause filed by Sri Saroj Kumar Jena owner of vehicle no. OR05Z-3279 has been considered.

Under the statute, the STA has no power to renew the permanent permit in cases where the application for renewal of permit was filed after expiry of permit.

Section 81 (2) & (3) of M.V. Act, 1988 are quoted below for better appreciation.

"(2) A permit may be renewed on an application made not less than fifteen days before the date of its expiry.

(3) Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (2), the Regional Transport Authority or the State Transport Authority, as the case may be, may entertain an application for the renewal of a permit after the last date specified in that sub-section if it is satisfied that the applicant was prevented by goods and sufficient cause from making an application within the time specified."

On plain reading of provisions contained under Section 81 (2) of M.V. Act, 1988, it can be safely concluded that application for renewal of permit shall be filed ***"before the date of its expiry"*** which means the application for renewal of permit cannot be filed after expiry of permit which has been done in the present case. On conjoint reading of Sub-section (2) and (3) of Section 81 of M.V. Act, 1988, ***it can be safely concluded that*** in cases where the application for renewal of permit is made after fifteen days of specified date mentioned in sub-section (2) and before expiry of permit, same can be considered under Sub-section (3) if the transport authority is satisfied that the applicant was prevented by good and sufficient cause from making an application ***within the time specified under Sub-Section (2).*** In no case application for renewal of permit can be entertained by STA after expiry of permit.

In this regard Hon'ble Supreme Court vide their judgment reported in AIR 1976 SC 2161 held that:

248

"7. xx xx xx The proviso to sub-section (2) requires that an application for renewal of a permit should be made not less than 120 days before the date of expiry of the permit. But, notwithstanding this provision, the Regional Transport Authority may, under sub-section (3), entertain an application for renewal of a permit after the last date specified in sub-section (2), "if the application is made not more than 15 days after said last date and is accompanied by the prescribed fee." Sub-section (3) thus vests a discretion in the Regional Transport Authority to entertain an application for renewal of a permit even if it is beyond time, but in that case the delay should not be of more than fifteen days. The word used in sub-section (3) is "may" and not "shall" and the Regional Transport Authority is given a discretion to entertain an application for renewal of a permit even where it is beyond time, though not more than 15 days. It may condone the delay or it may not, depending on the circumstances of each case. The discretion is to be exercised not on any arbitrary or fanciful grounds or whim or caprice of the Regional Transport Authority, but it is to be a judicial discretion. It is true that the criterion which is to guide the Regional Transport Authority in the exercise of its discretion is not articulated in sub-section (3), but it is implicit in every conferment of discretion on a judicial or quasi-judicial authority that the discretion is to be exercised in a judicial manner on well –settled legal principles. It would not be right to attribute to the legislature an intention to confer unguided and unfettered discretion on the Regional Transport Authority which is a quasi judicial authority. The discretion is obviously to be exercised where sufficient cause for not making the application for renewal within time is made out by the applicant. This criterion can legitimately be imported from Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963 which contains an allied provision for condonation of delay where an application is made beyond time. It could never have been the intention of the Legislature that even where there is no sufficient cause for delay in making an application for renewal, the Regional Transport Authority should still be bound to entertain the application for renewal merely on the ground that the delay is of not more than 15 days. Sub-section (3) enacts a



provision for condonation of delay in making an application for renewal and not a provision extending the time limit specified in the proviso to sub-section (2) in all cases as a matter of course. If the intention of the Legislature were that in every case delay of not more than 15 days in making an application for renewal should be condoned as of course, there was no need for a separate provision in sub-section (3), but the Legislature could have very well specified "one hundred and five days" instead of "one hundred and twenty days" in the proviso to sub-section (2)."

"8. It is, therefore, clear that sub-section (3) of Section 58 confers a discretion on the Regional Transport Authority to entertain an application for renewal when it is made beyond the time limit specified in the proviso to sub-section (2), but not more than 15 days late and the discretion is to be exercised in favour of entertaining the application for renewal when it is shown that there was sufficient cause for not making it in time. Now the question which arises is: does Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963 apply so as to empower the Regional Transport Authority, for sufficient cause, to entertain an application for renewal even where it is delayed by more than 15 days? Section 29,, sub-section (2) of the Limitation Act, 1963 makes Section 5 applicable in the case of an application for renewal unless its applicability can be said to be expressly excluded by any provision of the Act. The only provision of the Act sought to be pressed into service for this purpose was sub-section (3). Does sub-section (3) expressly exclude further extension of time under Section 5? If it does, then Section 5 cannot be availed of any the appellant for condonation of the delay. Sub-section (3) in so many terms says that the Regional Transport Authority may condone the delay in making of an application for renewal and entertain it on merits provided the delay is of not more than 15 days. This clearly means that if the application for renewal is beyond time by more than 15 days, the Regional Transport Authority shall not be entitled to entertain it, or in other words, it shall have no power to condone the delay. There is thus an express provision in sub-section (3) that delay in making an application for renewal shall be condonable only if it is of not more



than 15 days and that expressly excludes the applicability of Section 5 in cases where an application for renewal is delayed by more than 15 days. This provision may seem harsh, but it has been deliberately and advisedly made because the question of renewal of a permit must obviously be decided before the expiration of the period of the permit and in view of the elaborate procedure set out in Section 57 for dealing with an application for renewal, a certain minimum period before the expiration of the period of the permit must be provided within which this procedure can be completed so that the renewal can, if at all, be granted well in time before the permit expires. If an application for renewal could be entertained even if made at any stage, it would dislocate the procedural machinery set out in Section 57 and that is why the Legislature prescribed in sub-section (3) of section 58 that the delay in making an application for renewal may be condoned by the Regional Transport Authority only if it is of not more than 15 days. Here, the application made by the appellant for renewal of his permit was admittedly late by more than 15 days and hence the delay was not condonable and the Regional Transport Authority was right in rejecting the application for renewal as time barred."

Section 81 (3) of M.V Act, 1988 provides that the STA may entertain an application for renewal of permanent permit which was filed after the last date specified in sub-section (2) of Section 81 i.e. less than 15 days **before expiry of permit and not after expiry of permit.**

Considering facts and circumstances mentioned above, after due deliberation, STA decided to reject application for renewal of permanent permit filed by Sri Saroj Kumar Jena owner of vehicle no. **OR05Z-3279** after expiry of permanent permit in the ratio of decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court (supra) which is in aid and consonance of Section 81 (2) and (3) M.V. Act, 1988 and rules made there under and in view of the fact that the vehicle was under off road for one year and five months and not operating during the validity of permit. Application for renewal of permanent permit and replacement of vehicle are rejected. It was decided to notify the route in the



website inviting applications for grant of permanent permit in the interest of commuting public.

6. CANCELLATION OF ALL INDIA TOURIST PERMIT

ITEM NO.6.1:-CANCELLATION OF ALL INDIA TOURIST PERMIT GRANTED TO SUSIM KANTI MOHANTY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02BG-0557.

Heard Sri Susim Kanti Mohanty, owner of vehicle OD02BG-0557. The matter is deferred to next STA meeting for decision.

ITEM NO.6.2:-CANCELLATION OF ALL INDIA TOURIST PERMIT GRANTED TO SUSIM KANTI MOHANTY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02BG-0757.


Heard Sri Susim Kanti Mohanty, owner of vehicle OD02BG-0757. The matter is deferred to next STA meeting for decision.


Chairman
STA, Odisha, Cuttack.

Memo No. /TC.

Dt.

Copy to all members of STA for information.


Secretary,
STA, Odisha, Cuttack.