

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE PERMIT GRANT COMMITTEE VIRTUAL MEETING OF STA, ODISHA, CUTTACK HELD ON 16<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER, 2020 THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCE.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

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

At the outset the Chairman, STA welcomed all the participants to the virtual meeting.

101. ROUTE – PATNAGARH TO BARGARH VIA LOISINGHA, RAMPUR AND BACK, GANGADHAR PANIGRAHI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR03E1275.

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

102. ROUTE – CHAMPUA TO BHADRAK VIA GHATGAON, DHAKOTHA AND BACK, SANJAY KUMAR BEHERA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD09F0561.

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

103. ROUTE – BRAJARAJNAGAR TO SAMBALPUR VIA THELKOLOI, LAPANGA AND BACK, BIRANCHI NARAYAN BISWAL, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD23J4877.

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

104. ROUTE – BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO KHAIRA VIA CHARAMPA, RANITAL AND BACK, SATYA RANJAN MOHAPATRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD22R3585.

Applicant is represented by advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty.  
The following objectors have filed objections.

Q.

1. Shri Siba Narayan Mahala, owner of vehicle No.OD05D-9192 is represented by Advocate Shri M.B.Rao. He stated that the rationalized corridor is from Bhubaneswar to Bhadrak. Since the rationalization of timings is under process and not finalized, it should not be considered. Besides he stated that at Cuttack point, his departure time is at 8.10hrs. whereas the applicant has applied at 8.04hrs. just 6 minutes ahead of his service. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be given timing after his service.
2. Pranati Samal, owner of vehicle No.OD22R-1967 is represented by Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. He stated that objector to be operating her vehicle from Bhubaneswar to Balasore via Cuttack, Soro and Bhadrak. The service of this objector is departing Bhadrak at 16.05hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 15.56hrs. which is 9 minutes ahead of her service. Hence the objector has requested that the applicant may be given timing after her service.
3. Jyotsnamayee Rout, owner of vehicle No.OD04Q-1991 is represented by Sri Sukant Kumar Rout stated that the service of the objector is plying on the route Bhubaneswar to Balasore. Her departure time at Bhubaneswar is at 7.00hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Bhubaneswar at 6.59hrs. which is 1 minute ahead of her service. He further stated that since timing of the route is under rationalisation process, TP may not be considered in favour of the applicant.

105. ROUTE – KALAMGADIA TO BALASORE VIA SARBANA, NABRA AND BACKGLOSI MISHRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR11D5688.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.Rao. He stated that since the vehicle is 15 years old, he will replace a higher model vehicle within one month.

There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time and also replacement of higher model vehicle as undertaken before grant of permit.



106. **ROUTE –** BAHALDA TO DHAMARA VIA SARAT, KAPTIPADA AND BACK, LAXMIKANTA BASA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD11T0145.

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

Mir Reeday Rasool, owner of vehicle OD22Q-5387, objector is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.Rao. He stated that at Dhamra point there is clash of time. His vehicle is departing Dhamra at 4.57hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart Dhamra at 5.05hrs. which is 8 minutes after his service. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be given after his service. But at Basudevpur, of both the services departs at 6.30hrs. which is exact time. Hence the objector has requested that the time gap is to be maintained i.e 10 minutes from starting point from Dhamra onwards.

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

107. **ROUTE –** CHAUMUKHI TO JAIPUR VIA HALADIPADA, BALASORE AND BACK, NASIMA BANO, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD01A3898.

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

Sri Surya Kanta Nanda, objector owner of vehicle No.OD01-9779 stated that he is plying his service from Kasafal to Balasore and Balasore to Baliapal on the strength of permit issued by RTA, Balasore. The departure time is clashing at Langaleswar. His service is departing Langaleswar at 7.20hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Langaleswar at 7.36hrs. He stated that applicant may be allowed to leave Langaleswar at 7.40hrs. in a gap of 20 minutes.

The above objector further stated that his another vehicle OD01H-2569 stands in the name of his wife Smt. Manasi Nanda which is plying on the route Ratei to Balasore via Langaleswar, Jamudhadi, Darada, Rupsa on the strength of permit issued by RTA, Balasore. Her departure time at Langaleswar is 7.50hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to leave at 7.36hrs. Similarly, the service of this objector

departing Ratei at 7.30hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Ratei at 7.17 which is just 13 minutes ahead of her service. Hence the objector has requested that the applicant may be given time after timing of his above two services.

Since the applicant has applied inter region route just touching 10 kms. portion of Mayurbhanj region at Jaipur and have not mentioned the major stoppages, it should not be considered. Applicant may apply mentioning major stoppages. The permit details of objector may be uploaded in OPMS.

108. **ROUTE –** BARKOTE TO GAUSALA VIA TIKILIPADA, JAMANKIRA AND BACK, PRADEEP KUMAR SAHU, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD15D1011.

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

109. **ROUTE –** RAJBAHAL TO KUCHINDA VIA JINC NAGAR, JOGIMAL AND BACK, JITENDRA TANDIA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR16C5625.

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

110. **ROUTE –** KALTA TO GHATGAON VIA GURUDA, BAMEBARI AND BACK, LAXMAN BIRUA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD09H5073.

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

111. **ROUTE –** KEONJHAR TO BARIPADA VIA TANGABILLA, JASHIPUR AND BACK, SURESH CHANDRA SAHU, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR11G4318.

Applicant is present. There is one objection filed by Smt.Baijayanti Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OD09E-4805.

The objector is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that there is clash of time at Keonjhar point. The service of the objector is departing Keonjhar at 8.00AM whereas the applicant has applied to leave Keonjhar at 7.43hrs. i.e. just 17

2

minutes ahead of her service. At Jashipur, the proposed time given by the applicant is 17 minutes after the service of objector though the applicant leaves Keonjhar 17 minutes ahead of the service of the objector. Hence, the objector requested that the applicant may be given time after her service from Keonjhar.

Applicant stated that the above objector has applied TP which is at sl.no.259 with Keonjhar departure time at 7.48hrs.

The objector stated that his service is going to Jashipur via Khiching which is a different route & alignment.

Both the cases i.e. sl.No.111 and 259 should be considered together.

**112. ROUTE –** KANKADAHAD TO BARIPADA VIA DHENKIKOTE, PATNA AND BACK, ANADI CHARAN MOHANTY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD11A0799.

Applicant is absent. There is no objection.

**113. ROUTE –** KANKADAHAD TO BARIPADA VIA DHENKIKOTE, PATNA AND BACK, CHIRASMITA JENA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR11J4733.

Applicant is absent.

There is written objection filed by Smt. Priya Das, owner of vehicle No.OD11A-7669. She stated that her vehicle is plying on the route from Guhaldangiri to Anugul via Jashipur, Karanjia under STA permit. Her departure time at Jashipur in up trip towards Karanjia is 7.00hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Karanjia at 6.49hrs just 11 minutes ahead of her service. She requested that the applicant may be given time atleast half an hour after his service.

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



114. **ROUTE** – BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO DEOGARH VIA KAMAKHYANAGAR, PARJANG AND BACK, ADHIRAJ JENA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02AX2757.

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

115. **ROUTE** – DIMIRIKODA TO TALCHER VIA DEOGARH, KHILEI AND BACK, KSHIROD CHANDRA PRADHAN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD19J1003.

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

116. **ROUTE** – BALASORE TO DHAMARA VIA BETARHA, NARSINGHPUR AND BACK, ASHOK KUMAR GIRI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD01AH5219.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri H.P. Mohanty. He stated that the applicant has applied Balasore at 10.05 which may be changed to 10.10hrs. as this is vacant time of his earlier permit.

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

117. **ROUTE** – LARIAPALI TO SAMBALPUR VIA NIKTIMAL, MALIDIHI AND BACK, JAMES DANG, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR15M2012.

Applicant is absent. There is no objection.

118. **ROUTE** – SAMBALPUR TO SIRIGODA VIA BALLAM, BARKOTE AND BACK, PRAMOD KUMAR PADHEE, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR15N7931.

Applicant is absent. There is no objection.

119. **ROUTE** – BADASAH I TO BALARAMGADI VIA DURGADEVI CHHAK, REMUNA GOLAI AND BACK, MANAS RANJAN PATRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD01J0022.

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

120. **ROUTE –** ANANDAPUR TO BHADRAK VIA ORALI, BONTH AND BACK, PRADEEPTA PRIYADARSINI PANDA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD22Q9747.

Applicant is absent.

Smt. Minati Senapati, objector owner of vehicle No.OD22L-8555 is represented by Advocate Sri Ramesh Kumar Sahu. He stated that there is clash of time at Bhadrakh. Her service is departing Bhadrak at 9.40hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Bhadrak at 9.35hrs. i.e. just 5 minutes ahead of the service of this objector. The objector further stated that though the applicant has proposed to leave Bhadrak in 5 minutes ahead of her service, but applicant's vehicle reaches Anandpur at 12.51hrs. whereas the service of objector reaches Anandpur at 11.40hrs which is after the timings of service of objector. The objector further stated that the halting time given by the applicant at Barapada is 55 minutes for which the applicant's vehicle will reach Anandapur after the service of the objector. Hence the objector requested that the applicant may be given time after the service of this objector.

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

121. **ROUTE –** JAMDA TO ROURKELA VIA BILEIPADA, JODA AND BACK, JUDHISTHIR ROUT, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR11J7575.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri A.K.Mohanty. He stated that this is alter service of OD11A-2087. Following objectors have filed objections.

1. Sri Sarat Chandra Swain, owner of vehicle No.OR14Q-5074 is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that there is no such alter service is plying. He further stated that the proposed departure time given by the applicant is clashing at Koida. The objector service is departing Koida at 14.55hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Koida at 14.44hrs. which is just 11 minutes ahead of the service of objector. If TP

will be considered in favour of the applicant, then the timing may be given after the service of this objector.

2. Sri P.K.Swain, owner of vehicle No.OD14S-0374 is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that there is clash of time at Barbil. The service of objector is departing Barbil at 14.05hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Barbil at 13.48hrs. which is 17 minutes ahead of his service. Hence he requested that the applicant may be given time after the service of this objector.

This may be verified whether the alter service applied by the applicant is operating from Barbil NAC or not.

3. Sri Ujwal Kumar Sethi, Sri Sambhunath Mohanta, Sri Chandan Kumar Prahan, and Sri Chinmay Kumar Mishra Brahma, owner of vehicle No.OR09N-7307, No.OD09J-3747, OD09R-2325 and OR09N-7107 are represented by Advocate Sri M.B.Rao. He stated that the alter service applied by the applicant i.e. OD11A-2087 is not operating at all. Besides, there is clash of timings proposed by the applicant with the timings of objectors i.e. at Barbil in respect of vehicle No. OR09N-7307, the departure time of the service of this objector at Barbil is 9.45hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to leave Barbil at 9.36hrs. The departure time of vehicle No.OR09N-7107 at Barbil is 9.51hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Barbil at 9.36hrs. The departure time of vehicle No.OD09J-3747 at Champua point is 11.24hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Champua at 11.12hrs. and the departure time of vehicle No.OD02N-2325 from Champua is at 12.25hrs. whereas the applicant proposed to leave Champua at 12.11hrs. He further stated that the timings proposed by the applicant are irrational.

Further he stated that the distance between Champua to Barbil is 90 kms. which is taking to cover in 2 and half hours. But, the applicant has applied to cover the above distance in 2





hours. Hence Mr. M.B.Rao, Advocate appearing for the above objectors stated that the applicant may be given permit after verifying the plying of alter service.

Applicant stated that he would produce the parking receipt from Barbil and Champua NAC in respect of alter service.

122. **ROUTE –** KHARIAR TO TITILAGARH VIA JHARIAL, JAMTARA AND BACK, JAYANTI BAKUL, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR23F1681.

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

123. **ROUTE –** KESRAMAL TO ROURKELA VIA KANSABAHAL, VEDVYAS AND BACK, SANJEEB KUMAR PATRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD14V1956.

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

Objector Sri Ashok Kumar Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OR14W-7979 is represented by Advocate Sri D.B.Das. He stated that there is clash of time at 2 stoppages i.e. Nuagaon and Rourkela. At Nuagaon point, the service of this objector is departing at 12.10hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Nuagaon at 12.00hrs. which is 10 minutes before his service. At Rourkela, the service of this objector is departing at 14.40hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Rourkela at 14.30hrs. which is also 10 minutes ahead of his service.

Advocate appearing for applicant stated that, earlier he has taken a TP in respect of vehicle No.OR14U-7842 for the period from 16.6.2020 to 13.10.2020. Since he could not replace the vehicle in time, he has applied afresh in same timing. He further stated that, in this route the vehicles are operating in 5 to 7 minutes gap. 10 minutes gap is sufficient.

Applicant and objector agreed to exchange the timing.

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



124. ROUTE – KUTRA TO ROURKELA VIA RAIBAGA, BIRMITRAPUR AND BACK, SAROJ KUMAR SAHOO, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR14Q4654.

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

There are 6 online objections in OPMS portal. The gist of the objections are as follows:

1. Anand Vishwakarma, owner of vehicle No.OD14S6394 stated that the Departure time of his vehicle is 01:00 PM from Birmitrapur towards Rourkela and OR14Q4654 has applied Departure from Birmitrapur border is at 12:50 PM.
2. Sri Batia Lakra, owner of vehicle No.OD04G-9559 stated that OR14Q4654 has applied from Rourkela to Salangabahal departure time is 15:20 from Rourkela, the vehicle OR14S4974 has the departure time from Rourkela to Salangabahl at 15:40. it will travel through objector's entire route.
3. Sri Viswa Ranjan Singh, owner of vehicle No.OR14S-4974 stated that the owner of vehicle No.OR14Q4654 has applied from Rourkela to Salangabahal departure time is 15:20 from Rourkela, the vehicle OR14S4974 has the departure time from Rourkela to Salangabahl at 15:40.
4. The CEO of Sundargarh Urban Transport Trust that the City Bus OD14G2829 Rourkela departure towards Birmitrapur is 7:45 AM but applicant proposed timing for Rourkela departure is 7:40 AM. It is just before 5 minutes.
5. The CEO SUTT stated that their bus OD14G2822 Birmitrapur departure time towards Rourkela is 6:05 AM but applicant proposed time of OR14Q4654 is 6:00AM towards Rourkela from Birmitrapur. It is just 5 minutes ahead of their service.
6. Sri Himanshu Bhusan Nayak, owner of vehicle No.OR14S-9577 stated that the applicant Saroj Kumar Sahoo owner OR14Q4654 proposed Rourkela departure time towards Birmitrapur 15:20 but OR14S9577 is plying from Rourkela to Birmitrapur is 15:25. It is just 5 minutes before of his service.



It may be examined whether the route is covering rationalised portion or not. Then it may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

**125. ROUTE –** ROURKELA TO JAMANKIRA VIA BAMURA, GHUNGUTI AND BACK, LINKUSH AGARWAL, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD14U7313.

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

**126. ROUTE –** BIHABANDHA TO ROURKELA VIA RAIBAGA, BIRMITRAPUR AND BACK, SAROJ KUMAR SAHOO, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR14S2768.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.Rao. There are 4 online objection and the gist of which are given below.

1. Sri Batia Lakra, owner of vehicle No.OD14G-9559 stated that the applicant has applied 5 mins before his permit time. His timing is 17.20 and the applied time is 17.15 that is the departure time from Rourkela.
2. Sri Ashok Vishwakarma, owner of vehicle No.OR14N-8211 stated that the applicant has applied departure time from Rourkela at 12:00PM and his service OR14N8211 is a permanent permit holder and his departure time is 12:05PM at Rourkela and there is 5 minutes gap.
3. Md. Fakarudin, owner of vehicle No.OD14C-1658 stated that the applicant has applied departure from Birmitrapur to Rourkela at 10:07 am and the departure time of his service OD14C1658 is 10:14 am. At Biramitrapur. So there is a gap of only seven minutes.
4. Md. Fakarudin, owner of vehicle No.OD14M-2094 stated that the applicant has applied departure time from Birmitrapur Border at 04:25am and his vehicle is plying under a permanent permit and departure time at Biramitrapur is 04:35am.

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

127. **ROUTE –** BIHABANDHA TO ROURKELA VIA HATIBARI, KALOSARIA AND BACK, JASINTA BARLA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR23D7681.

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

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

128. **ROUTE –** BAULA TO KARANJIA VIA GHASIPURA, DHAKOTHA AND BACK, SUSHIL KUMAR RAO, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD04A5572.

Applicant is absent. Following objectors have filed objections.

1. Sri Kulamani Samal, owner of vehicle No.OD05AP-0717 stated that the portion of route i.e. Bhubaneswar to Keonjhar i.e. (portion from Anandpur, Dhenkikote and Karanjia) is covering under rationalization of timing process. Hence, he requested that the permit may not be granted to the applicant.
2. Sri Pramod Kumar Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OR09AN-0545 stated that there is clash of time from Panikoili to Keonjhar distance of which is 55 kms. His service is departing Ghasipura at 7.45hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Ghasipura at 7.48 i.e. just three minutes after his service. He further stated that the departure time of another vehicle No.OR05AS-3399 (stands in the name of Padma Lochan Sahu) at Ghasipura is 8.00hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Ghasipura at 7.48hrs. just 12 minutes ahead of his service.

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

129. **ROUTE –** SUBDEGA TO ROURKELA VIA TUDALAGA, KUTRA AND BACK, ASHWINI KUMAR NAIK, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD16B0491.

Applicant is absent. Following objectors have filed objections.

1. Sri Pradeep Kumar Patel, owner of vehicle No.OD16C-0507 is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the 70% of route is covering under rationalized route from Sundargarh to Rourkela and the applicant has not applied in vacant slot.

2. S.M.Samim Akhtar, owner of vehicle No.OR16-C-8774 is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the applied route of the applicant is covering rationalised timing portion from Kutra to Rourkela. Besides, he stated that though the applicant has proposed to depart Subdega at 5.50hrs. i.e. 35 minutes ahead of the service of this objector but will reach Rourkela 6 minutes prior to the service of objector which is irrational. Hence objector requested that since the applied route is covering 70% of rationalised route from Sundargarh to Rourkela, his application for TP may not be considered and may be rejected.
3. Sri Ganjhu Bagh, owner of vehicle No.OD16G-3636 is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that in down trip at Rourkela, his service is departing at 11.05hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Rourkela at 11.04hrs. just one minutes before objector's service. He further stated that the route applied by the applicant is covering 60% of rationalised route from Sundargarh to Rourkela.
4. Md.Yahya, owner of vehicle No.OR16B-0987 stated that he is plying his service on the route Barangakachhar to Rourkela under STA permit. The timing proposed by the applicant is clashing at Ekma, Tudalaga, Kutra, Rairangpur, Kansbahal and Rourkela. His departure time at Ekma is 6.55hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart Ekma at 7.05hrs. which is just 10 minutes after his service. Further, he stated that at Rourkela, his departure time is 10.14hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Rourkela at 10.04hrs. which is 10 ahead of objector's service. He further stated that another bus No.OR16-C-8774 is also plying in a gap of 25 minutes after his service from Subdega to Rourkela on the same route.
5. Sri Radheshyam Prasad Jaiswal, owner of vehicle No.OD16B-7455 stated that he is plying his service on the routed Daldali to



Rourkela via Sundargarh, Rajgangpur and back. But the applicant has applied to depart Ranibandha Rajgangpur station at 8.50hrs. which is 2 minutes ahead of objector's service which is clashing up to Rourkela. Further he stated that there is clash of time from Tudadlaga to Rourkela which is 60 kms. and the route applied by the applicant is covering 60% portion of rationalised route from Sundargarh to Rourkela. Hence, he has requested that the applicant may not be granted TP.

It may be verified whether the route applied by the applicant covers some portion of the rationalised route and proposed timing given by the applicant is clashing with the timing of above objectors.

**130. ROUTE –** BAHIAM TO ROURKELA VIA GARPOSH, KUTRA AND BACK, MD ZAHIR, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR16B8821.

Applicant is absent. Following objectors have filed objections.

Later Advocate Sri B.N.Prasad has filed an Vakalatnama on behalf of applicant.

1. Sri Sushil Kumar Sharma, owner of vehicle No.OR16D-7355 is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the objector is plying his above service on the route Rathadoli to Rourkela covering the rationalised portion from Rourkela to Sundargarh. His departure time from Rourkela is 9.13hrs. in slot No.52 and departure time from Sundargarh is at 13.49hrs. vide slot No.92. But the applicant has applied on the route Bahima to Rourkela covering the major portion of the rationalised route from Kutra to Rourkela and has proposed to depart Rourkela at 8.59hrs though there is a vehicle at 9.02hrs in slot No.50. In the down trip it has proposed to depart Rajgangpur at 13.35 though there is a vehicle at 13.34hrs and 13.02 hrs. The applicant has proposed to depart Rourkela at 15.10hrs. when there is a vehicle at 15.12hrs. in slot No.110 towards Rajgangpur. He further stated

*Q.*

that the applicant had earlier applied for the same route in respect of his same vehicle covering the rationalised portion Rourkela to Kutra which was placed in the Permit Committee meeting held on 6.3.2020 at sl.No.79 and the same was rejected on the ground of rationalisation of route and the applicant has now again applied for the same. Hence he requested that the application of the applicant may be rejected.

2. Sri Prasant Kumar Swain, Managing Partner of SAMPARK is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty He stated that the proposed timing given by the applicant is clashing with the timing of SUTT buses i.e. OD14Q-2832 in both up and down trips i.e. 13.35 from Rajgangpur station and 15.10 from Rourkela station in return trip. A bus bearing No.OD14G-2832 belongs to SUTT is leaving Rajgangpur towards Rourkela at 13.40hrs whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Rajgangpur at 13.35hrs just 5 minutes ahead of their service. In return trip another SUTT bus No.OD14F-7180 is leaving Rourkela towards Rajgangpur at 15.15hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Rourkela at 15.10hrs i.e. just 5 minutes ahead of their service. He further stated that the route from Rourkela to Kutra is covering portion of rationalised route from Sundargarh to Rourkela. This objector has also given online objection mentioning the above facts.
3. Sabita Rout, owner of vehicle No.OD14F-2698 is represented by Advocate Sri H.P. Mohanty. He stated that the departure time given by the applicant is clashing from Rajgangpur to Rourkela. The departure time of this objector at Rajgangpur is at 7.22hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart at 7.20 which is 2 minutes ahead of the service of this objector. Further he stated that the route applied by the applicant is covering 60% of the rationalised route Sundargarh to Rourkela. She has also given an objection mentioning the above facts online.

2.

4. Md. Isrul, owner of vehicle No.OD16A-3786 is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the departure time given by the applicant at 8.59hrs. at Rourkela is clashing with the departure time of his service. His service is departing Rourkela at 9.00hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart just 1 minute ahead of his service. He further stated that the route applied for by the applicant is covering 60% portion of rationalised route from Sundargarh to Rourkela.
5. Sri Indrajit Singh, owner of vehicle No.OR16B-8899 stated that the proposed timing given by the applicant in up trip between Garposh to Rairangpur is 10 minutes ahead of his service from Purukapali to Rajgangpur. He further stated that the route applied by the applicant is covering major portion of rationalised route from Sundargarh to Rourkela. He has also given an online objection in respect of his another vehicle No.OD16-3697 wherein he has stated that the applicant proposed Ekma departure timing 05.34 hrs. before his bus timing which will hamper his bus upto Rourkela via. Rajgangpur, Kutra on the village route.
6. Sri Kishore Sarangi, owner of vehicle No.OD16-3663 has given an objection online. He stated that the applicant applied 08.59 hours proposed dep. timing just 1 minute before ordinary bus service OD 16 B 3786, which is regularly departing Rourkela station towards Rajgangpur, Kutra at 09.00 hours.

The above objectors stated that the applicant had earlier applied for the same route in respect of his same vehicle covering rationalised portion Rourkela to Kutra which was placed in the Committee meeting held on 6.3.2020 at sl.No.79 and the same was rejected on the ground of rationalisation of route and the applicant has now again applied for the same. Hence he requested that the application of the applicant may be rejected.

This may be verified.





131. **ROUTE –** SAMBALPUR TO SAGJORI VIA HATIBARI, JUJUMURA AND BACK, DEBENDRA PRADHAN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR23C9122.

Applicant is absent. Since the route applied by the applicant is covering only one RTA i.e. RTA, Sambalpur, this may not be considered.

132. **ROUTE –** MAHULPADA TO JARSINGHA VIA KHAMAR, PABITRANAGAR AND BACK, LASHMITA SAHU, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR14X8779.

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

133. **ROUTE –** GONDROTOLI TO SUNDARGARH VIA EKMA, SAHAJBAHAL AND BACK, NIRANJAN SINHA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD16E6231.

Applicant is absent. Since the route applied by the applicant is covering only one RTA, so this may not be considered.

134. **ROUTE –** DEOGAON TO ROURKELA VIA BARGAON, RANIBANDH AND BACK, OWNER OF VEHICLE, NIRANJAN SINHA OD16G4554.

Applicant is absent. Following objectors have filed objections.

1. Sabita Rout, owner of vehicle No.OD14F-2698 is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the major portion of the route applied by the applicant is covering in rationalized route Sundargarh to Rourkela. The route applied by the applicant from Deogaon to Subdega and Deogaon to Sundargarh and back coming under rationalized route. Besides, there is clash of time at Rourkela. The applicant has proposed to leave Rourkela at 9.26hrs. whereas the objectors' service is at 9.27hrs. just one minutes ahead of his service and will cover up to Bargaon about 71 kms. Similarly, the applicant has proposed to leave at 8.03hrs. from Rajgangpur which is one minute prior to slot No.22 and in another trip it has proposed to depart Rajgangpur at 10.49hrs and there is a service at 10.47hrs.(slot No.57) and at 10.53hrs. (slot No.58). Besides, the applicant has proposed to depart Sundargarh at 16.50hrs and there is a vehicle at 16.48hrs. in (slot

Qr

No.121) and at 16.54hrs (slot No.122). Moreover, the applicant has not applied in any vacant slot.

2. Sri Indrajit Singh, owner of vehicle No.OD16-3697 stated that the route Rourkela and Sundargarh is rationalised route and 70% of the route applied by the applicant is covering in above rationalised route. Besides the timing applied by the applicant is clashing with the timing of his service at Ranibandh Station. The applicant has applied to leave Ranibandha at 8.03hrs. just 2 minutes ahead of his service. The departure time given by the applicant is 2 minutes ahead of his service, but the applicant will reach Rourkela after 32 minutes of his service. The distance from Ranibandha to Rourkela is 35kms.

It may be verified.

**135. ROUTE –** KHAIRA TO KIRIBURU VIA GHATGAON, DHENKIKOTE AND BACK, MALATI SAHOO, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR09K9875.

Applicant is absent. Following objectors have filed objections.

1. Sri Bipin Bihari Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OD09P-6651, Sri Arnibash Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OD09Q-9851 and Sri Satya Ranjan Soren, owner of vehicle No.OD09F-8651 are represented by Advocate Sri M.B.Rao. He stated that at Keonjhar point, the applicant has proposed to depart at exact time i.e. 9.30hrs. of the departure time of vehicle No.OD09P-6651. Similarly the applicant has proposed to depart Keonjhar at 9.30hrs. whereas the vehicle No.OD09Q-9851 is departing at 9.35 which is just 5 minutes before his service. Similarly, the vehicle No.OD09F-8651 is departing Keonjhar at 9.35hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to leave Keonjhar at 9.30hrs. which is also 5 minutes ahead of this objector. As regards the departure time at Barbil, the objector's service is departing at 13.45hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Barbil at 13.40hrs. just 5 minutes ahead of his service. In return trip the applicant has proposed to leave Barbil at

*Q.*

13.40hrs. whereas the vehicle No.OD09F-8651 is leaving at 13.45hrs which is just 5 minutes ahead of this objector.

2. Sri Ganesh Prasad Pati, owner of vehicle No.OR09N-6427 is represented by Advocate Sri S.S.Mishra. He stated that the proposed route applied by the applicant is covering Category 'A' under rationalised route i.e. Bhubaneswar/Cuttack to Keonjhar via Anandpur. It may be examined. He stated that there is clash of time from Chhenapadi to Keonjhar which is a distance of 100kms. At Chhenapadi the departure time applied by the applicant is 6.30hrs. whereas the objectors' service is departing Chhenapadi at 6.25hrs i.e. just 5 minutes after the service of this objector. At Ghasipura, the applicant has applied to leave at exact time of this objector. Similarly, the departure time applied by the applicant is clashing at Ghatagaon and Dhenkikote also.
3. Sri Ranjan Kumar Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OD09R-8625 stated that from Anandpur to Remuli, there is clash of time. He requested that since this is a rationalised route, the TP may not be granted in favour of the applicant's vehicle.

It may be verified.

136. **ROUTE –** AINTHAPALI TO RABAGA VIA LAIDA, SAMSINGHA AND BACK, PRAMOD RANJAN SAHOO, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD15J7584.

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

137. **ROUTE –** TANGARPALI TO AINTHAPALI VIA KANTAPALI, JHARSUGUDA AND BACK, KALYANI PRADHAN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD23D2883.

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

138. **ROUTE –** KUARMUNDA TO SAMBALPUR VIA SAHASPUR, LAIKERA AND BACK, SUDHIRA BEHERA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD15E4395.

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

9

139. **ROUTE –** MANOHARPUR TO JHUMPURA VIA KERKERA, SINGADA AND BACK, KALYANI MAJHI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR09L2797.

Applicant is absent.

There is an objection filed by Sri Krishna Gopal Das, owner of vehicle No.OD01P-0141. He stated that his service to be departing Karanjia at 8.10hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to leave Karanjia at 7.55hrs. just 15 minutes ahead of his service. Hence he has requested that the applicant may be given time at least half-an-hour after his service.

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

140. **ROUTE –** BURLA TO PATRAPARHA VIA TAIN SAR, DEOGARH AND BACK, MANORANJAN PANIGRAHI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD15D7199.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. There is no objection.

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

141. **ROUTE –** BADIBAHAL TO KALUNGA VIA KESEIBAHAL, GOBINDPUR AND BACK, SAIRINDHRI PATEL, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR14U9852.

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

There is one written objection given by Sri Pradyumna Kumar Patel, owner of vehicle No.OD15R-2624. He stated that at Keseibahal, the proposed time given by the applicant is jumping and this is continuing up to Niktimal. He is operating his above service on the route from Malichhua to Baragaon.

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

142. **ROUTE –** BAGEDIA TO ROURKELA VIA DEOGARH, BALLAM AND BACK, NABIN KUMAR MISHRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD28A5445.

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

Following objectors have filed their objections.

1. Sri Srikant Biswal, owner of vehicle No.OR16B-5825 is represented by Advocate Sri S.K.Mohanty. He stated that the service of this objector is plying on the route Bimala to Rourkela and back.

Q.

There is clash of time from Barkote to Rajamunda. His service is departing from Barkot is at 8.55hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to leave Barkot at 8.45hrs. Similarly at Rajamunda, the vehicle of this objector is departing at 10.15hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to leave Rajamunda at 10.10hrs. just ten minutes ahead of his service. The applicant has applied to ply his service as Express service whereas the objectors' vehicle is plying as ordinary service.

2. Sri Sachikanta Das, owner of vehicle No.OR15J-6626 stated that he is operating his service from Deogarh to Rourkela and back. He is stated that the brother-in-law of this applicant Sri Dwiti Krishna Mishra had earlier applied TP for the above route on the timings mentioned by the applicant in respect of his vehicle OR15M-0355, but the same has not been considered. As he was not allowed this timing, he went an appeal to Hon'ble STAT, Cuttack. Hon'ble STAT reminded the case to Secretary, STA for consideration. Since he is a senior operator, he was granted time at 13.30hrs.

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

**143. ROUTE –** KHANDADHAR TO ROURKELA VIA RAJAMUNDA, CHANDIPOSH AND BACK, JAYANTI SINGH, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR23E3681.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. Following objectors have filed objection.

1. Sri Rajesh Kumar Pradhan, owner of vehicle No.OD14K-1279, OD14M-6179 and Sri Rakesh Kumar Pradhan, owner of vehicle No.OD14P-3279 represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the above objectors are operating their above three vehicles on the route Tendra to Rourkela, Sarsara to Rourkela and Sendpur to Rourkela on the strength of PP issued by RTA, Rourkela. The departure time of above vehicles from Lahunipada

Q<sub>2</sub>

are at 6.25hrs. 6.10hrs. and 6.45hrs. respectively whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Lahunipada at 6.33hrs. Similarly the vehicles of above objectors i.e. No. OD14K-1279 and OD14M-6179 are departing Rourkela at 14.50hrs. and 15.30hrs. respectively whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Rourkela at 15.08 hrs. thereby will operate ahead of the service of the above objectors in between the Lahunipada to Rourkela and Rourkela to Lahunipada. Further the objectors stated that the inter-trip applied by the applicant from Rourkela to Rajgangpur covers the major portion of the rationalized route Rourkela to Sundargarh. Further, he stated that the timings proposed by the applicant from Rourkela at 9.45hrs towards Rajgangpur will clash with the existing services operating on the rationalized portion with a gap of only 6 minutes and there is a service at 9.47hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to operate just 2 minutes ahead of a service. Hence he requested that the applicant may not be allowed to operate his service in inter trip from Rourkela to Rajgangpur which cover rationalized route and proposed timings applied by the applicant from Lahunipada at 6.33hrs. and from Rourkela at 15.08 may be revised and the applicant may be allowed to operate his service after the services of the objectors in maintaining reasonable gap.

2. Sri Indrajeet Singh, owner of vehicle No.OD16-3697 is represented by his representative Sri S.Singh. He stated that there is clash of time at Rourkela. His service is departing Rourkela at 9.55hrs. towards Rajgangpur whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Rourkela at 9.45hrs. Further, the proposed timings applied by the applicant is irrational as he is taking more than 2 hours to reach Rajgangpur. The timing may be rationalised.

Applicant is agreed to take out the inter trip.



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

144. **ROUTE –** CHAMPUA TO KARANJIA VIA KEONJHAR, SANKARPUR AND BACK, ASHRAM CH. MAJHI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR09M1887.

Applicant is absent.

There is one written objection filed by Smt. Priya Das, owner of vehicle No.OD11E-4033. She stated that her service is plying on the route 'Jamuda to Angul via Keonjhar'. Her service is departing Keonjhar at 10.30hrs. towards Singda on the up trip whereas the applicant has applied to leave Keonjhar at 10.20hrs. which is 10 minutes ahead of her service. Hence, she has requested if the TP will be considered to the applicant, then applicant may be given time at least half-an-hour after her service.

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

145. **ROUTE –** BOUDH TO ANGUL VIA THAKURGARH, ANANDAPUR AND BACK, SANJIB KUMAR PRADHAN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD19R3104.

Applicant is absent.

There is written objection filed by Sri Deba Krushna Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OR19L-0900. He stated that the applicant has applied TP ahead of his service. His service is departing Angul at 11.35hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed leave Angul at 11.07hrs. He requested that applicant may be given time after 12.00hrs which will be after his service

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

146. **ROUTE –** SINGHASINI TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA BHEJIPUT, BALUGAON AND BACK, SURAT PRADHAN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD095969.

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

Objector Smt. Sujata Pattnaik, owner of vehicle No.OD02C-7777 is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the service of this objector to be departing Bhubaneswar at 15.30hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Bhubaneswar at 15.21hrs. which

is just 9 minutes ahead of the service of this objector. Hence, the objector has requested that the applicant may be given time after the service of the objector.

Applicant stated that there is another vehicle No.OD02AH-0282 plying between 15.26 to 15.30hrs. This may be examined.

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

**147. ROUTE –** KHILOLI TO JEYPORE VIA UMARKOTE, DABUGAM AND BACK, SUNIL KUMAR PADHY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD10D1114.

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

Following objectors have filed their objections.

1. Sri Tirupati Panigrahi, owner of vehicle No.OD24D-4947 is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that at Umarmkote and Jeypore, there is clash of time. At Umarmkote, the service of this objector is departing at 8.00 hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave at 7.55hrs. just 5 minutes ahead of his service. Similarly the departure time of this objector at Jeypore point is 12.25hrs. whereas the applicant has applied in exact time of this objector i.e. at 12.25hrs. Hence he requested that the applicant may be given 10 minutes gap after his service.
2. Sri Narendra Kumar Mohanty, owner of vehicle No.OD01N-3296 is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that at Khalikote, there is clash of time. His service is departing Khalikote at 5.50hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Khalikote at 5.45hrs. which is just 5 minutes ahead of his service. Hence he requested that the applicant may be given time after his service.
3. Sri Maheswar Bisoi, owner of vehicle No.OD24B-9585 is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the applicant may be given time after his service.

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



148. **ROUTE –** PHULABANI TO ATTHAMALLIK VIA SARSARA, BOUDH AND BACK, RAJ KISHOR PATTANAIK, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR23D8777.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri A.K. Mohanty. There is no objection.

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

149. **ROUTE –** BHAWANIPATANA TO TITILAGARH VIA UTKELA, KESINGA AND BACK, BABITA SAHU, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR267343.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri A.K. Mohanty. There is no objection.

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

150. **ROUTE –** SALIASAHI TO BUGUDA VIA BHEJIPUT, BANIABADI AND BACK, HARIHAR PATTANAIK, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02BJ8435.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the starting point Saliasahi may be deleted and the applicant may be allowed to start from Baramunda, Bhubaneswar instead of Saliasahi and Bhubaneswar departure time 5.38hrs. may be changed to 6.04hrs.

Following objectors have filed objections.

1. Sri Raghunath Behera, owner of vehicle No.OD02BA-5810 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.Rao. He stated that his departure time from Bhubaneswar is at 5.40hrs. If the applicant shall be allowed to leave Bhubaneswar at 6.04hrs., then he has no objection.
2. Sri Rajendra Kumar Behera, owner of vehicle No.OD02Z-5502 is represented by Advocate Sri S.S.Mishra. He stated that in up trip at Polasara, his service is departing at 12.12hrs. whereas the applicant has applied in same time i.e. at 12.12hrs. Hence he has requested that the applicant may be given time after his service.

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

Q.

151. **ROUTE –** KUKUDAHANADI TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA BALUGAON, KHURDHA AND BACK, BALARAM PANIGRAHY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD07H8755.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri K.Mohammad.

Objector Md. Fayaz, owner of vehicle No.OR02AY-4629 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.Rao. He stated that the departure time of the service of this objector at Berhampur is 5.00hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to leave Berhampur at 4.45hrs. which is 5 minutes ahead of his service. Adequate gap may be maintained.

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

152. **ROUTE –** MACHHAGAON TO JEYPORE VIA DIGAPAHANDI, RAYAGADA AND BACK, DEEPIKA JENA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD24B5467.

Applicant is represented by his brother Sri Ramesh Chandra Jena. He stated that this is alter service of sl.no.153. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

153. **ROUTE –** MACHHAGAON TO JEYPORE VIA DIGAPAHANDI, RAYAGADA AND BACK, ROJALINE JENA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD24B5437.

Applicant is represented by his brother Sri Ramesh Chandra Jena. This is alter service of sl.No.152.

154. **ROUTE –** NUAPADA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA PALURU JN, KESHPUR AND BACK, SANTOSH PRADHAN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR09Q6427.

Applicant is absent. Following objectors have filed objections as follows:

1. Smt. Pankajini Panda, owner of vehicle No.OD32A-4535 is represented by her husband Sri Manoranjan Panda. He stated that at Berhampur, his service is departing at 10.30hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to leave Berhampur at same time i.e. at 10.30hrs. The applicant may be given time 10 minutes after his service.

The timing of another vehicle of this objector bearing No. OR02AY-4628 is also clashing at Kespur with the proposed timing



given by the applicant. The service of this objectors' vehicle OT02AY-4628 departs Kesapur at 6.26hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Kespur at 6.27hrs. just one minute after her service. Applicant may be given at least 10 minutes gap after his service. The above objector has filed an online objection and the facts are same.

2. Sri Sumit Kumar Jena, owner of vehicle No.OD02W-4404 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.Rao. He stated that at Nuapada there is clash of time. His service is departing Nuapada at 4.05hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to leave Nuapada at 4.00hrs. just 5 minutes ahead of his service. He stated that applicant may be given after his service. He further stated that timing applied by the applicant is slightly irrational which may be rectified.

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

**155. ROUTE –** INDRAVATI TO POLASARA VIA RAYAGADA, GUMUDA AND BACK, PURNABASI ROUT, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02BL2288.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Mr. K.Mohammad. He stated that this is alter service of sl.no.156. There is no objection.

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

**156. ROUTE –** INDRAVATI TO POLASARA VIA RAYAGADA, GUMUDA AND BACK, PANCHANAN ROUT, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02BL3377.

This is alter service of sl.no.155. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

**157. ROUTE –** MASTERCANTEEN (CITY BUSSTAND) TO BOUDH VIA KANTILO, GANIA AND BACK, HRUDANANDA DASH, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02BH6611.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri D.B.Das. Following objectors have filed objections.

1. Talat Parween, owner of vehicle No.OD02AK-6199is represented by Advocate Mr. R.P.Kar. He stated that there is clash of time in

Q.

the entire route. The service of this objector is departing Bhubaneswar at 5.50hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart Bhubaneswar at 5.15hrs. i.e.35 minutes ahead of the service of this objector. Besides, there are two other applicants have also applied on same route vide sl.no.163 and 190. The entire route covers common corridor from Bhubaneswar to Boudh. Hence, the objector requested that the applicant may be given time after her service maintaining adequate time gap.

2. Sri Simachal Routray, owner of vehicle No.OD33T-1212 stated that there is clash of time at Bhubaneswar. His service is departing Bhubaneswar at 5.30hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Bhubaneswar at 5.15hrs. which is just 15 minutes ahead of his service. He stated that the applicant may be given time after his service. He further stated that the applicant had not paid tax and not got valid Insurance Certificate.

Applicant stated that he had got a new vehicle and submitted all documents which may be verified.

This may be considered together with sl.no. 161,163,165, 186 and 190.

**158. ROUTE – BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO ANGUL VIA NARHUAPADA, BHAPUR AND BACK, MANAS RANJAN SAHOO, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02AY1305.**

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

Following objectors have filed their objections.

1. Sri Alok Kumar Routray, owner of vehicle No.OF05K-8579 is represented by Advocate Sri S.S.Mishra. He stated that the objector is operating his above vehicle on the route Bhubaneswar to Angul and back via Athgarh, Bhapur and Mahidharpur. His departure time at Bhubaneswar is at 5.00hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Bhubaneswar at 4.42hrs. just 18 minutes ahead of his service. Though the applicant has proposed to leave Bhubaneswar with a gap of 18 minutes ahead of the service of this objector, but his proposed reaching time at Angul is

Q.

at 11.15hrs. when the arrival time of this objector at Angul is 9.56hrs. which is 1 hour and 19 minutes after the service of this objector. The timing given by the applicant is completely irrational. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be given clash free time.

2. Sri Jyotikanta Das, owner of vehicle No.OD05AL-6355 is represented by Advocate Sri S.S.Mishra. He stated that his service is plying on the route from Puri to Angul and back via Bhubaneswar, Jatmundia, Naduapada, Bhapur, Rasol, Mahidharpur. He stated that in the up trip at Bhubaneswar, his vehicle is departing at 5.39hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Bhubaneswar at 4.42hrs. which is 57 minutes ahead of his service. Since the applicant has proposed to depart 57 minutes ahead of his service, but he will arrive at Angul at 11.15hrs. whereas his vehicle is reaching Angul at 10.15hrs. which is one hour gap after the service of this objector. Hence this objector has requested that if the applicant will be allowed TP, then in the up trip timing may be allotted clash free time.

Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty, appearing for the applicant stated that he had applied to leave Bhubaneswar at 4.42hrs. But the owner of vehicle No.OD05AL-2745 has surrendered his permit with departure time at Bhubaneswar was 4.40hrs. Then he requested that the time 4.40 may be given to the above applicant.

**159. ROUTE – JANHIKUDA TO BERHAMPUR VIA MALUDA, BAJRAKOT AND BACK, SUMIT KUMAR JENA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02W8004.**

Applicant is absent. There was no objection.

Later there are three objections received from the following objectors.

1. Sri Bharat Nayak, owner of vehicle No.OR07P-1975 stated that his service is departing Janhikud at 4.00hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to leave Janhikud at 4.28hrs. Similarly the

Q

departure time of the service of this objector at Charichhak is 5.25hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Charichhak at 4.49hrs.

2. Runu Pandit, owner of vehicle No.OR07Z-1223 and OR07AC-6691 stated that her above two service are plying on the route Kanheipur to Berhampur via Keshpur and Berhampur to Khalikote since long. Her arrival time in respect of vehicle No.OR07Z-1223 at Khalikote is same as proposed by the applicant. Further, she stated the applicant has not mentioned the stoppage at Khalikote. The timing of her another vehicle OR07AC-6691 is also clashing at Kanheipur. Her service is departing Kanheipur at 10.55hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart Kanheipur at 10.48hrs. which is 7 minutes ahead of her service. Similarly, at Chhatrapur, the departure time of this objector is 9.10hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to leave Chhatrapur at 9.22hrs. Hence, this objector has objected the timings of applicant at Kanheipur and Chhatrapur.

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

160. **ROUTE –** ASKA TO GUNUPUR VIA MOHANA, ADAVA AND BACK, SMT .LILI KUMARI BISOI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD07AF3553.

Applicant is absent. There is one objection filed by B. Leelanath, owner of vehicle No.OR07Z-5558. He stated that the applied route of applicant in both up and down trips is different alignment. Applicant should apply in same alignment in both trips.

This may be verified and considered subject to verification of alignment of both trips and also clash free time.

161. **ROUTE –** MASTERCANTEEN (CITY BUSSTAND) TO BOUDH VIA KANTILO, GANIA AND BACK, ANNAPURNA RANASINGH, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02BJ1635.

9

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. Following objectors have filed their objections.

1. Sofia Sultana, owner of vehicle No.OD02A-9367 is represented by Advocate Shri R.P.Kar. He stated that this objector is operating her service on the route Bhubaneswar to Boudh via Kantilo, Dasapalla and back. The service of objector is departing Bhubaneswar at 6.20AM whereas the applicant has applied to leave Bhubaneswar at 5.55hrs. which is 25 minutes ahead of the service of objector. He stated that the applicant may be given timing after the service of this objector maintaining sufficient time gap.
2. Sri Niladri Mohapatra, owner of vehicle No.OR02AP-2459 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.Rao. He stated that there is clash of time in respect of vehicle of this objector at Bhubaneswar. The service of objector is departing Bhubaneswar at 6.10hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Bhubaneswar at 5.55hrs. just 15 minutes ahead of the service of this objector. This objector is proposed to exchange the timings with the timing applied by the applicant.

The nature of service will be express service applied by the applicant. Time gap will not be reduced.

This may be verified and considered subject to verification of clash free time from Baramunda point instead of Master Canteen and considered with sl.no.157, 163, 165, 186 and 190.

**162. ROUTE –** CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) TO BERHAMPUR VIA KHURDHA, CHHATRAPUR AND BACK, SUDHANSU SEKHAR CHOUDHURY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05AV9917.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. Following objectors have filed their objections.

1. Sri Surendra Mohanty, owner of vehicle OD02BJ-7858 and OR02BU-0057 represented by Advocate Sri D.B.Das. He stated



that the objector is plying his above two services on the route Puri to Berhampur via Bhubaneswar and Cuttack to Berhampur via Chhatrapur respectively. His vehicle No.OD02BJ-7858 is departing Bhubaneswar at 8.15hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Bhubaneswar at 7.59hrs. which is 16 minutes ahead of his service. At Khurda, the gap is decreasing to 12 minutes. The gap is very short and he requested that sufficient gap should be maintained. His another vehicle No.OR02BU-0057 is departing Bhubaneswar at 9.00AM towards Berhampur. Hence he requested that the applicant may be given time after his service.

2. Sri Pratyush Kumar Chhotray, owner of vehicle No.OR23E-3100 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.Rao. He stated that there is clash of time at Bhubaneswar starting point. His service is departing Bhubaneswar at 8.00hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to leave Bhubaneswar at 7.59hrs. which is just 1 minute ahead of his service and time is clashing in entire route from Bhubaneswar to Balugaon which is 100kms. distance.
3. Zakira Begum, owner of vehicle No.OR07T-1440 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.Rao. He stated that at Berhampur, there is clash of time. The service of objector is departing Berhampur at 15.25hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Berhampur at 15.13hrs. which is 12 minutes ahead of the service of this objector. He stated that applicant may be given timing after his service.
4. M. Fayaz, owner of vehicle No.OD15E-6456 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.Rao. He stated that the vehicle of objector is plying on the route Cuttack to Berhampur via Bhubaneswar, Balugaon and back. The service of this objector is departing Berhampur at 14.55hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart Berhampur at 15.13hrs. just 18 minutes after his service.

Q.



Hence, he has requested that the applicant may be given time after his service.

**163.ROUTE –** BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO BOUDH VIA GANIA, DASHAPALLA AND BACK, SIMANCHAL ROUTRAY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD33AA8759.

There are three objections filed by the following objectors.

1. Talat Parween, owner of vehicle No.OD02AK-6199 is represented by Advocate Sri R.P.Kar.
2. Sri Sudarsan Nayak, owner of vehicle No.OR02AA-2099 is represented by Advocate Sri D.B.Das.
3. Sri Hrudananda Das, owner of vehicle No.OD02BH-6611 is represented by Advocate Sri D.B.Das.

This may be considered together with sl.no.157, 161,165, 186 and 190.

**164. ROUTE –** HATIOTA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA BHEJIPUT, BALUGAON AND BACK, SK KAMALUDDIN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02T5670.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Mr. K.Mohammad. Following vehicle owners have filed their objections.

1. Pankajini Panda, owner of vehicle No.OD32A-4535 is represented by her husband Sri M.K.Panda. He stated that in down trip at Khurda, there is clash of time. His departure time from Khurda is at 11.35hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Khurda at 11.30hrs. just 5 minutes ahead of her service. He further stated that another service of this objector i.e. OD32B-3135 is departing Khurda at 11.50hrs. Hence the objector has requested that the applicant may be given timing after the service of this objector.
2. Sri Prasanna Kumar Sahoo, owner of vehicle No.OR02AA-5099 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.Rao. He stated that his



service is plying from Balipadar to Bhubaneswar via Polsora. He stated that his above service is departing Bhubaneswar at 11.00hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Bhubaneswar at 10.55hrs. i.e. 5 minutes ahead of the service of this objector. The common corridor is from Bhubaneswar to Polasara distance of which is 162kms.

3. Sasmita Sahoo, owner of vehicle No.OD02AC-3132 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.Rao. He stated that the applicant's applied time is prior and jumping timing from Hatiota to Bhubaneswar. He requested that the applicant may be given time after his service.

Applicant stated that he may be given time at 10.55hrs. from Bhubaneswar.

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

**165. ROUTE –** KIIT SQUARE TO BOUDH VIA KANTILO, GANIA AND BACK, SANTA RANJAN SAHOO, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR05AC6355.

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

1. Sri Hrudananda Das, owner of vehicle No.OD02BH-6611 is represented by Advocate Sri D.B.Das. He stated that, this objector has applied in same route vide sl.no.157. His timing may be shifted.
2. There is a written objection filed by Dhaneswar Sahoo, owner of vehicle No.OR04Q-0085 represented by Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. He stated that this objector is plying his bus on the route from Rasulgarh to Baliput via Khurda, Kantilo and back. He stated that the departure timing of this objector in up trip at Bhubaneswar is 4.50hrs. whereas the applicant proposed to depart Bhubaneswar at 4.51hrs. just one minute after the service of this objector. Hence he requested that the applicant may be given time after the service of this objector.



3. Manjubala Prusty, owner of vehicle No.OR25-8299 stated that she is operating her service on the route Bhubaneswar to Phulbani. Her service is departing Bhubaneswar at 4.35PM whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Bhubaneswar at 4.51PM from Baramunda, Bhubaneswar. Hence this objector requested that the applicant may be given time after her service from Bhubaneswar.

This may be considered from Barmunda instead of KIIT Square together with sl.no. 157,161,163, 186 and 190.

166. **ROUTE –** ASKA TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA BALUGAON, KHURDA BY PASS AND BACK, BIRENDRA SINGH, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05P8283.

Applicant is absent. Following three vehicle owners have submitted objections.

1. Sri Pratyush Kumar Chhotray, owner of vehicle No.OR02AM-1705 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.Rao. He stated that this objector is plying his service on the route Kumaranga to Nandankanan via Bhubaneswar and back. His departure time from Bhubaneswar is at 14.30hrs. whereas the applicant has applied in same time to depart Bhubaneswar i.e. at 14.30hrs. The common corridor is from Bhubaneswar to Balugaon which is about 100 kms. Hence he requested that the applicant may be given time after the service of this objector.
2. Laxmipriya Mohanty, owner of vehicle No.OR02BL-2133 and OD02AZ-8433 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.Rao. He stated that the above objector is plying her two services mentioned above on the route Manikpur to Bhubaneswar via Aska with Aska Departure time at 6.00hrs. and Sarangipalli to Bhubaneswar via Aska with Aska departure time at 5.50hrs. The applicant has proposed to depart Aska at 6.00hrs. which is exact time of this objector. The common corridor is from Aska to



Berhampur which is about 176kms. Hence this objector requested that the time may be allowed after her service.

3. Sri Satyanarayan Panda, owner of vehicle No.OD02R-9599 and OR02AR-6499 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.Rao. He stated that this objector is plying his above two services on the route Gokranpur to Bhubaneswar via Purusottampur and Barhagada to Bhubaneswar via Purusottampur. He stated that the applicant has proposed to depart Purusottampur at 6.45hrs. in up trip which is exact time of his vehicle No.OD02R-9599 and the departure time of his another vehicle No. OR02AR-6499 is at 7.05hrs. Similarly, in the return trip at Bhubaneswar, the departure time of this objectors' is at 14.30hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Bhubaneswar at 14.35hrs. which is just 5 minutes after his service. The common corridor is from Purusottampur to Bhubaneswar which is around 150kms distance. Hence, the objector requested that the applicant may be given time after his above two services.

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

167. **ROUTE –** MARADIPANGA TO KALINGA VIA DASINGBADI, DARINGBADI AND BACK, TILSWAR NAYAK, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD187476.

Applicant is absent. Since the route applied by the applicant is coming under one RTA i.e. Phulbani, it should not be considered.

168. **ROUTE –** MUNIGUDA TO BAMUNIGAM VIA SALKI, DANEIBADI AND BACK, MARTIN BALIARSINGH, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD12A4581.

Applicant is absent. There is one objection filed by Sri Manas Ranjan Pradhan, owner of vehicle No.OR02BK-4120 represented by Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. He stated that at Muniguda, there is clash of time. The service of objector is departing Muniguda at 5.00hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Muniguda at 4.45hrs.



just 15 minutes ahead of his service. Hence he requested that the applicant may be given time after the service of this objector.

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

169. ROUTE – BERHAMPUR TO RAYAGADA VIA ADAVA, PADMAPUR AND BACK, GANESH NAYAK, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR15N1855.

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

170. ROUTE – RAIKIA TO UTTARA VIA ODAGAON, NAYAGARH AND BACK, SAMIR KUMAR DAS, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02BF9329.

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

171. ROUTE – BHABINIPUR TO NAYAGARH VIA BUGUDA, KARACHULI AND BACK, MD AZAD, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD09G0466.

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

172. ROUTE – BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO KANIARY VIA BEGUNIPADA, KODALA AND BACK, RAJENDRA KUMAR BEHERA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02AN6802.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri S.S.Mishra. There is an objection filed by the following owner.

Sri Manas Kumar Mohapatra, owner of vehicle No.OR02BG-6633 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.Rao. He stated that this objector had applied to operate his service on the route Bhubaneswar to Bhetanai via Beguniapada which is listed against sl.no.177. At Polasara there is clash of time. This objector stated that if Bhubaneswar departure time at 4.08hrs. and Polsara departure at 10.25hrs. allotted to the applicant's service, then the objector will be highly prejudiced. Hence he requested that the applicant may be

2

allotted Bhubaneswar departure time at 4.00hrs. instead of 4.08hrs and Polsora departure time after 10.25hrs.

This may be considered together with sl.No.177. Higher model will be given priority.

**173. ROUTE –** BIJAPUR TO MOHANA VIA GADAPUR, BAMUNIGAM AND BACK, REENA DHEEBAR, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD18G7227.

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

**174. ROUTE –** KALYANSINGHPUR TO NARAYANPATNA VIA J K PUR, RAYAGADA AND BACK, JAGANNATH PRADHANI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD18F0688.

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

**175. ROUTE –** TALAGAM TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA NACHUNI, TANGI AND BACK, SAHOO BIJAYA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02Z0115.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Mr. K.Mohammad. Following vehicle owner have filed objections.

1. Laxmipriya Mohanty, owner of vehicle No.OR02BL-2133 and OD02AZ-8433 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.Rao. He stated that the applicant is dead; hence permit cannot be considered to a dead person. Besides, this objector stated that the proposed departure time given by the applicant at Bhubaneswar i.e. at 11.30hrs. is exact time of this objector. The common corridor is from Bhubaneswar to Bhejipur which is about 120kms, the objector requested that the applicant may be given time after his service.

This may be examined whether applicant is dead and permit applied by him can be considered or not. If so, this may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

Q

176. ROUTE – CHANDESWAR TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA TANGI, KHURDHA AND BACK, SUMIT KUMAR JENA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02AH0282.

Applicant is absent.

Objector Smt. Sabitri Pattnaik, owner of vehicle No.OD02A-9237 is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that at Ramachandrapur and Tangi, there is clash of time. The service of this objector is departing Ramachandrapur at 5.10hrs. and Tangi at 5.38hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Ramachandrapur at 5.20hrs. and Tangi at 5.26hrs. Though the applicant has proposed to leave Ramachandrapur 10minutes after the service of objector, but at Tangi it operates 12 minutes ahead and reaches Bhubaneswar 7 minutes after the service of the objector which is irrational timings proposed by the applicant. Hence, he requested that the timings proposed by the applicant from Chandeswar to Bhubaneswar may be revised and he may be allowed to operate after the service of this objector without overtaking en-route.

Later on 18.12.2020, the applicant is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.Rao and filed a petition. He stated that due to network problem, the applicant could not connect online and participate in the virtual hearing and got deprived of defending his case on 16.12.2020. Applicant stated that he objected the objection raised by the objector to the suggested timings given by the applicant. Applicant stated that he had proposed to operate his vehicle as express service whereas the objectors' service to be plying as ordinary service. Hence, applicants' service is bound to overtake the service of the objector enroute for which objection to suggested timings is unjustified. Secondly the service of the objector is halting at Ramachandrapur which is a small place for 10 minutes whereas the applicant has proposed to halt for 2 minutes at Badapari which is the next stoppage of Ramachandrapur.

9

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

**177. ROUTE –** BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO BHETANAI VIA BEGUNIAPADA, KODALA AND BACK, MANAS KUMAR MOHAPATRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR02BG6633.

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

There is a written objection filed by Sri Rajendra Kumar Behera, owner of vehicle No.OD02AN-6802 represented by Advocate Sri S.S.Mishra. He stated that this may be considered together with sl.no.172 wherein this objector is applicant. He stated that at Polsara, the departure time of both the services are same i.e. at 10.25hrs. Hence, he suggested that 10 minutes gap may be maintained. This objector may be given time to depart Polasara at 10.20hrs. and applicant may be given to depart Polsara at 10.30hrs.

Both the parties are agreed to depart Bhubaneswar at 4.00hrs. in respect of applicant of sl.no.172 and at 4.15hrs. in respect of the applicant of sl.no.177.

This may be considered together with sl.No.172 and subject to clash free time.

**178. ROUTE –** BERHAMPUR TO KURAL VIA BALIPADAR, BUGUDA AND BACK, SRIKANT KUMAR SAHU, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD07F5273.

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

1. Zohara Begum, owner of vehicleNo.OR07P-5725 is represented by Advocate Mr. K.Mohammad. He stated that there is clash of time at Berhampur. The service of this objector is departing Berhampur at 6.50hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Berhampur at 6.40hrs. just 10 minutes ahead of the service of objector. Hence he requested that the applicant may be given time after the service of objector maintaining a reasonable time gap.

Q



Advocate appearing for the applicant stated that the proposed departure time 6.40hrs. is the existing time of his earlier permit of this applicant against this vehicle from Berhampur till Aska. He stated that at Aska point, the time may be modified to 8.15hrs. instead of 8.10hrs.

2. S.Reena Prusty, owner of vehicle No.OD07K-5888 is represented by her son Sri Chetan Prusty. He stated that the service of objector is plying on the route Nayagarh to Berhampur. While his service is coming back from Kural to Berhampur via Odagaon, Buguda, the applicant has applied for halting timing in 5 to 20 minutes. So the objector requested that the halting time of applicant may be reduced as per STA guide lines.
3. Sri Sibnarayan Pradhan, owner of vehicle No.OR07T-0840 stated that the departure time of his service at Buguda is 13.55hrs. towards Ballipadar whereas the applicant has applied to depart Buguda at 13.50 just 5 minutes ahead of the service of objector. Hence he requested that the applicant may be given time after his service at 14.05hrs. instead of 13.50hrs.

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

**179. ROUTE –** RAYAGADA TO BERHAMPUR VIA LUHAGUDI, TAPTAPANI AND BACK, SANDHYA RANI SAHU, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD07N8141.

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

**180. ROUTE –** CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) TO TURUBADI VIA CHIKILI, BARASARA AND BACK, SUSANTA PRADHAN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD19J2599.

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

181. ROUTE – SADANGIPALLI TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA KABISURYANAGAR, BUDHAMBHA AND BACK, DEEPAK KUMAR DASH, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR12A9066.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri S.S.Mishra. He stated that there is another bus No.OD02AQ-8409 plying on the route from Gobara to Cuttack via Aska. The departure time of his service at Gobara is at 3.25hrs. The proposed time of the applicant at Gobara is at 3.25hrs. which may be changed to 3.05hrs.

Following objectors have submitted their objections.

1. Sri Tribrikam Dash, owner of OR22-F-3198 is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the service of objector is operating on the route Pailipada to Bhubaneswar and back. He stated that there is clash of time at Bhubaneswar towards Gobara in down trip. His departure time at Bhubaneswar at 12.55hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart Bhubaneswar at 12.41hrs. which is 14 minutes ahead of his service. Hence he requested that applicant may be given time after the service of this objector or at 12.25hrs. and the objector may be given time to leave Bhubaneswar at 12.40hrs. Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty appearing for the objector will submit Vakalatnama regarding taking time 12.25hrs, otherwise his case shall not be considered.
2. Later on 18.12.2020, Sasmita Sahoo, owner of vehicle No.OD02AC-3132 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.Rao. He stated that due to net work problem, the applicant could not connect online and participate in the virtual hearing and got deprived of submit her objection to the grant of TP in favour of applicant. He stated that there is clash of time at Budhamba, Kodala and Khalikote. The service of this objector is departing Budhamba at 4.59hrs., Kodala at 5.10hrs. and Khallikote at 5.42hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart from above three points at 4.56hrs., 5.10hrs. and 5.42hrs respectively which is almost exact time of objector. The common corridor is

Q

from Budhaamba to Bhubaneswar which is 160kms.distance. Hence, the objector requested that the applicant may be given time after his service.

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

**182. ROUTE –** BERHAMPUR TO ALLADI VIA BALIPADAR, BELAGUNTHA AND BACK, SRIKANT KUMAR SAHU, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD07G9173

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. There is one objection filed by the following owners.

1. Sri Balaram Panigrhai, owner of vehicle No.OD07Q-7875 is represented by Advocate Mr. K.Mohammad. He stated that at Berhampur, there is clash of time. The service of this objector is departing Berhampur at 7.08hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Berhampur at 6.55hrs. which is 13 minutes ahead of the service of objector. He also stated that the common corridor is from Berhampur to Jagannath Prasad. Hence he requested that applicant may be given time after objector's service.
2. Sri Suryanarayan Pradhan, owner of vehicle No.OR02AA-1267 stated that there is clash of time at Balipadar and Belaguntha. The departure time of the vehicle of this objector from Balipadar is at 9.12hrs. towards Belaguntha and departure time from Belaguntha is at 16.30hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Balipadar at 9.15hrs. which is 3 minutes after the service of this objector and depart Belaguntha at 16.30hrs. which is exact time of this objector. Hence, the objector has requested that the applicant may be given time at 8.50hrs. instead of 9.15hrs. from Ballipadar and at 16.00hrs. instead of 16.30hrs. from Belaguntha which is not clashing with any other vehicles.

Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty appearing for applicant stated that there are other services which are plying in every 5 minutes gap. He requested that the proposed departure time of the



applicant at Aska point may be given to 8.35hrs. instead of 8.29hrs.

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

**183. ROUTE –** KUNDURA TO JAGANNATH PUR VIA NABARANGPUR, DANGARBHEJA AND BACK, SOMANTH BEHERA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD10K8202.

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

**184. ROUTE –** BELAGUNTHA TO BERHAMPUR VIA ASKA, HINJILICUT AND BACK, SRINIBAS PANDA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD205122.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Mr. K.Mohammad. Following vehicle owners have submitted their objections.

1. Sri Mrutyunjay Panigrahi, owner of vehicle No.OR07U-1907 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.Rao. He stated that the departure time at Balipadar is clashing with the proposed time given by the applicant. The service of this objector is departing Balipadar at 7.30hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 7.21hrs. which is 9 minutes ahead of the service of this objector.

Applicant stated that the gap may be increased by another 5 minutes. But the objector stated that the applicant may be given after his service.

2. There is one online objection given by Sri Ranjit Kumar Padhi, owner of vehicle No.OR07AA-4989. He stated that the applicant has applied 5 minutes after his timings from Belaguntha and 8 minutes before his timing from Aska. He requested that the applicant may be given time after his service.

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

**185. ROUTE –** ALARIGADA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA PURUSHOTTAMPUR, BALUGAON AND BACK, SAHOO BIJAYA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02J7115.

Applicant is absent. Advocate Mr. K.Mohammal has withdrawn his power as the applicant is reportedly dead.

Following three vehicle owners have submitted objections represented by Advocate Sri M.B.Rao.

1. Laxmipriya Mohanty, owner of vehicle OR02BL-2133 and OD02AZ-8433 stated that her above two vehicles are plying on the route Manikpur to Bhubaneswar via Aska with Bhubaneswar departure time at 11.40hrs and Sarangipalli to Bhubaneswar via Aska with Bhubaneswar departure time at 11.30hrs. respectively. Applicant has sought for TP to operate on the route, Alarigada to Bhubaneswar and back. Applicant is dead, hence permit cannot be considered to a dead person. Besides, objector stated that the proposed departure time given by the applicant at Bhubaneswar i.e. at 11.30hrs. which is exact time of this objector. The common corridor is from Bhubaneswar to Kodala distance of which is about 140kms. The objector requested that the applicant may be given time after his service.
2. Sri Laxmidhar Khuntia, owner of vehicle No.OD02AH-6925 stated that since the applicant is dead, permit cannot be considered to a dead person. The objector further stated that the departure time suggested by the applicant at Bhubaneswar i.e. at 11.35hrs. is directly clashing with the departure time of this objector. Hence he has requested that the applicant may be given time after his service.
3. Sri Satyanarayan Panda, owner of vehicle No.OD02R-9599, OR02AR-6499 and OR02AZ-5199 stated that he is operating his above three vehicles on the route Gokranpur to Bhubaneswar via Purusottampur and back, Barhagada to Bhubaneswar via Purusottampur and back and Kukudakhandi to Bhubaneswar and back respectively. The above objector stated that there is clash of time at Hinjilicut i.e. at 5.45hrs. in the up trip. The applicant has proposed to depart Hinjilicut at 5.45hrs. whereas the departure



time of his vehicle No.OD02R-9599 is at 6.00hrs. i.e. 15 minutes after the service of this objector, and 6.19hrs. of his another vehicle OR02AR-6499. Similarly, the applicant has proposed to depart Bhubaneswar at 11.35hrs. in return trip, whereas the objectors' vehicle OR02AZ-5199 is departing Bhubaneswar at 12.00hrs. The common corridor is Hinjilicut to Bhubaneswar distance of which is about 170kms. Hence the objector requested that the applicant may be given time after his existing time.

This may be examined whether applicant is dead and permit applied by him can be considered or not. If so, this may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

**186. ROUTE – BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO BOUDH VIA KANTILO, GANIA AND BACK, RANJAN KUMAR BEHERA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD33AB8434.**

Applicant is present. Following two objectors have submitted objections.

1. Sofiya Sultana, owner of vehicle No.OD02A-9367 is represented by Advocate Sri R.P.Kar. He stated this objector is operating her vehicle on the route Bhubaneswar to Boudh via Kantilo, Dasapalla and back. The vehicle of the objector is departing Bhubaneswar at 6.20hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart Bhubaneswar at 5.50hrs. which is 30 minutes ahead of the service of this objector.
2. Sri Gourang Pradhan, owner of vehicle No.OR02BC-8685 is represented by Advocate Sri D.B.Das. He stated that the objector is operating his service on the route Bhubaneswar to Khamarsahi via Khandapada and back. The service of this objector is departing Bhubaneswar at 5.50hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Bhubaneswar at same time i.e. at 5.50hrs. from Bhubaneswar. The common corridor is from Bhubaneswar to Khandapara. Hence he requested that the applicant may be given any time after his service.

Q

Applicant stated that the timing may be allotted to his service from Bhubaneswar at 4.50hrs. and from Boudh at 14.00hrs.

This may be considered subject to make it clash free time.

This may be considered from Barmunda instead of KIIT Square together with sl.no. 157,161,163, 165 and 190.

**187. ROUTE –** PATRAPUR TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA BALUGAON, CHANDAPUR AND BACK, MOHAMMAD FAYAZ, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD04J2011.

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

There is one objection filed by Sri Balaram Panigrahi, owner of vehicle No.OD07AD-9639 represented by Advocate Mr. K. Mohammad. He stated that there is clash of time from Chhatrapur to Chikiti. Hence, he requested that the applicant may be given time after the timing of this objector.

Applicant stated that the portion from Patrapur to Berhampur may be deleted. He may be allowed only from Berhampur.

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

**188. ROUTE –** DHUMABHATA TO SONEPUR VIA CHERUPALLI, SALEBHATA AND BACK, K NABA KISHORE REDDY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD15L5921.

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

There is an objection filed by Sri Trilochan Bhoi, owner of vehicle No.OR15P-4003. He stated that from Padmapur to Cherupalli distance of which is 75 kms. is common corridor. He stated that the applicant may be allowed to depart Padmapur at 5.30hrs. instead of 5.54hrs. towards Cherupalli. There are 2 more vehicles plying in the route. Hence he requested that the adequate time gap may be maintained.

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

**189. ROUTE –** CHILIKHAMA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA ODAGAON, SARANKUL AND BACK, SANTOSH KU PALTASINGH, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02AE8906.

Applicant is present.

Q

There is one objection filed by Sri Sridhar Pradhan, owner of vehicle No.OD25J-5352 represented by Advocate Sri S.S.Mishra. He stated that in the down trip from Bhubaneswar, there is clash of time. His service is departing Bhubaneswar at 11.55hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Bhubaneswar at 11.40hrs.. At Sarankul, the vehicle of this objector is departing at 14.58hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Sarankul at 14.57hrs. just 1 minute ahead of the service of this objector. The objector further stated that timing applied by the applicant in up trip at Chilikhamaat 5.20hrs is just 29 minutes ahead of his service i.e. at 5.20hrs. But the service of this objector overtakes in between Odagaon and Sarankul and the timing of this objector at Sarankul is at 7.05hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Sarankul at 7.29hrs. The vehicle of objector is reaching Bhubaneswar at 9.55hrs. whereas the vehicle of applicant will arrive at 10.46hrs. That means the vehicles of objector overtakes the vehicle of the applicant in between Odagaon and Sarankul and reaches 51 minutes earlier at Bhubaneswar. Hence objector has requested that the timing of applicant may be rationalized and applicant maybe given time after his service in down trip maintaining adequate time gap.

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

190. **ROUTE –** MASTERCANTEEN (CITY BUSSTAND) TO BOUDH VIA KANTILO, GANIA AND BACK, SUBRAT KUMAR DASH, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD17T1919.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the starting point Master Canteen may be deleted. He suggested that the departure time may be given to depart from Bhubaneswar at 5.00hrs. instead of 5.15hrs. There are 5 objectors have given their objection.

1. Sri Hrudananda Das, owner of vehicle No.OD02BH-6611 is represented by Advocate Sri D.B.Das.

2,



2. Talat Parween, owner of vehicle No.OD02AK-6199 is represented by Advocate Sri R.P.Kar.

Applicant stated that the vehicle of objector No.2 i.e. OD02AK-6199 has been seized because of tax default.

Advocate appearing for objector No.2 i.e. OD02AK-6199 stated that the objector has gone to Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble High Court have given time up to Monday. On verification, it is found that there is tax amount of Rs.6,72,445/- is pending against the vehicle No. OD02AK-6199.

Advocate Sri D.B.Das, appearing for the objector No.1 i.e. Sri Hrudananda Das, owner of vehicle No.OD02BH-6611 stated that when the matter is subjudice in the Hon'ble High Court, the applicant in a thought that the permit of OD02AK-6199 has been cancelled for which he has applied TP.

This may be considered together with sl.no. 157. 161,163,165 and 186.

191. **ROUTE –** BERHAMPUR TO PURI BUS STAND VIA PAIKARAPUR, SATAPADA AND BACK, JALANDHAR BALIARSINGH, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR13H0057.

Applicant is present.

There is an objection filed by Sri Bichitra Kumar Jena, owner of vehicle No.OR02X-3800. He stated that his bus is plying in the route Hinjilicut to Puri and back. His departure time at Paluru Junction is at 6.35hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Paluru jnat 6.15hrs. Then the objector stated that the applicant may be given time after his service at Palur. Besides, this objector has also filed an online objection mentioning the same ground.

Applicant stated that he had a RTA permit from 2002 in respect of the same vehicle. He has applied in the same time in respect of same vehicle adding 53 kms.

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

2

192. **ROUTE –** PARADIP TO KEONJHAR VIA BALICHANDRAPUR, KRUSHNADASPUR AND BACK, JITENDRA KUMAR SAHOO, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05AV8714.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that he has applied in slot no.8 in up trip and slot no.57 in down trip from Chandikhole in category 'C'.

Following owner have submitted objection:

1. Smt. Josnamayee Rout, owner of vehicle No.OD04J-1991 is represented by Sri Susant Rout. He stated that the route is under rationalization process. Hence TP may not be considered. Moreover, applicant is covering the entire route from Chandikhole to Keonjhar. Besides, there is clash of time at in up trip at Chandikhole. His departure time from Chandikhole is 8.00hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Chandikhole at 7.51hrs. which is 9 minutes ahead of the service of objector. The time is clashing from Chandikhole to Keonjhar.
2. There is another objection filed by owner of vehicle No.OD04J-5085 without signature. This should not be considered as there is no signature found in the objection petition.

This may be verified whether the applicant has applied in any vacant slot in the rationalised route and in clash free timings. If so then it may be considered subject to clash free time taking into account rationalisation process.

193. **ROUTE –** PARADIP TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA GARADPUR, TIRTOL AND BACK, PABITRA MOHAN KHATUA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR05AR0908.

Applicant is absent.

There is an objection filed by Chinmoy Ranjan Parida, owner of vehicle No.OD05T-1240 represented by Advocate Sri M.B.Rao. He stated that applicant has applied in same departure time of Paradeep i.e. at 6.20hrs. whereas the service of this objector is departing with same timing. There is no vacant time on the rationalized corridor. If it

Q,

is considered, then the applicant may be given time after the service of this objector.

This may be verified and considered subject to clash free time and also in vacant slot in rationalized route.

**194. ROUTE –** CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) TO AMBIKI VIA JAIPUR, MANIJANGA AND BACK, BIJAY KUMAR PANDA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05AN0051.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that he has applied in slot No.19 from Cuttack towards Jaipur and from Jaipur in slot No.81, Cuttack- Puri slot No.219 from Cuttack and in down trip in slotNo.317 from Puri which are vacant slots.

The objector Sri Arup Kumar Prusty, owner of vehicle No.OD13F-0504 is represented by Advocate Sri R.P.Kar. He stated that this objector has applied in slot no.219-A Cuttack-Puri vide sl.No.270. This may be considered together with sl.No.270.The matter has already been heard in STA meeting held on 14.12.2020. There is a Tribunal order. Slot No.219A and 39A will be heard.

This may be verified and considered together with sl.No.270.

**195. ROUTE –** MAHALA TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA RAGHUNATHPUR, SOMAPUR AND BACK, KISHORE CHANDRA BISWAL, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05AW3334.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the applicant has applied in slot No.33 and 78 from Tarapur, and slot No.32 and 65 from Cuttack.

There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of vacant slots applied by the applicant.

**196. ROUTE –** PARADIP TO CHANDIKHOLE VIA DUHURIA, BALICHANDRAPUR AND BACK, SANTANU KU KHILAR, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR04K3985.

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

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

Q

197. **ROUTE –** PAKTIA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA BARIPADA, BALASORE BYPASS AND BACK, JYOTIRMAY BEHERA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR11K2338.

Applicant is present. He stated that this is alter service of sl.no.198. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

198. **ROUTE –** PAKTIA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA BARIPADA, BALASORE BYPASS AND BACK, RABINDRA NATH BEHERA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR11G6595.

This is alter service of sl.No.197.

199. **ROUTE –** UADAYPUR TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA JALESWAR, BALASORE AND BACK, DINAKRUSHNA DAS, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR01N0957

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.Rao. He stated that there is no bus from Udayapur to Bhubaneswar in day time for which the applicant has applied to operate his bus as day service. Further he stated that the applicant wants to ply his above service as non-stop after Jaleswar till the destination point without touching Balasore, Bhadrakh and Chandikhole.

Following objectors have submitted objections.

1. Smt. Minati Senapati, owner of vehicle No.OD22F-1555 is represented by Sri Ramesh Kumar Sahu. He stated that at Bhubaneswar, there is clash of time. Her service is departing Bhubaneswar at 4.00PM. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 3.50hrs. which is 10 minutes ahead of her service from Bhubaneswar.
2. Sri Ratikanta Senapati, owner of vehicle No.OD22-D-1555 stated that there is clash of time at Cuttack. His service is departing Cuttack at 16.05hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Cuttack at 15.50hrs. which is 15 minutes ahead of his service.
3. Mr.Baaz Mohammad Khan, owner of vehicle No.OD16-8325. He stated that the objector is operating his service on the route Bhadrakto Balasore and back and Balasore to Cuttack and back

Q

to Bhadrak. There is clash of time at Cuttack. The service of objector is departing Cuttack at 15.50hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Cuttack at 15.50hrs. which is exact time of objector. Besides, objector stated that the applied route lies in rationalisation portion from Bhubaneswar to Balasore which may not be considered as per policy decision of STA.


Since the route applied by the applicant is in rationalisation portion from Bhubaneswar to Balasore, it should not be considered. It may be verified.

**200. ROUTE –** BHOLAGADIA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA NILAGIRI, SERGARH AND BACK, NIBEDITA DAS, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD042445.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri S.S.Mishra. He stated that the applicant has applied in downtrip slot no.64 and in up trip slot no.151 in category-B.

The objector Sri Ratikanta Parida, owner of vehicle No.OD22D-7727 is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the proposed route covers the rationalized portion from Bhadrak to Bhubaneswar and since the process of rationalization has not been completed and the applications of the existing operators for change of slots has not been completed, the proposed route and timings may not be given to the applicant. Besides, he stated that the applicant in its up trip has proposed to depart Nilagiri at 7.05hrs., Bhadrakh at 8.58hrs. to reach Bhubaneswar at 12.38hrs. which is 5 minutes after the service of objector from Nilagiri and thereafter operate 2 minutes ahead from Bhadrakh and reach Bhubaneswar 17 minutes prior to the service of this objector which proves that irrational timings proposed by the applicant.

Since the slots are not opened, this should not be considered.

  
 4-1-2021  
 Transport Commissioner-Cum-  
 Chairman, STA, Odisha, Cuttack.