

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE PERMIT GRANT COMMITTEE VIRTUAL MEETING OF STA,
ODISHA, CUTTACK HELD ON 17TH DECEMBER, 2020.**

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.

201. **ROUTE –** KALIPADA TO BERHAMPUR VIA SORO, BHADRAK AND BACK, MANASI NANDA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD22A2979.

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

Following objectors have raised their objections.

1. Pranati Nalini Samantra, owner of vehicle No.OD02AS-7799 is represented by Advocate Mr.K.Mohammad. He stated that this objector is plying her service on the route from the Jarada to Rairangpur via Berhampur, Bhubaneswar, Balasore and Baripada. In return trip, the applicant has proposed to depart before the service of this objector. The departure time of the service of this objector from Balasore is 21.58hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Balasore at 21.32hrs. Similarly at Bhadrak, the applicant has proposed to depart at 23.33hrs. whereas the objectors' service is departing Bhadrak at 23.53hrs. i.e. the applicant has applied 20 minutes before the service of the objector. Further the objector stated that the route applied by the applicant is covering on rationalized portion from Balasore to Bhubaneswar. Hence the objector requested that TP may not be considered.
2. Baijayantimala Nayak, owner of vehicle No.OR02BG-7857 is represented by Advocate Mr. K. Mohammad. He stated that this



objector is plying her service as alter service of OD02AS-7799. He stated that at Balasore, Bhadrakh, Cuttack and Bhubaneswar, the applicant has proposed to depart ahead of the service of this objector with a gap of 26 minutes, 19 minutes, 16 minutes and 8 minutes respectively. Hence this objector stated that the applicant may be given time after her service.

3. Sri Brundaban Gaan, owner of vehicle No.OD05H-2888 is represented by Advocate Sri A.K. Behera. He stated that the service of this objector is departing Balasore at 22.30hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Balasore at 21.32hrs. Hence he requested that the applicant may be given time after the service of this objector.
4. Sri Ajay Kumar Barik, owner of vehicle No.OD05V-1099 is represented by his son Sri Manish Barik. He stated that his service is departing Berhampur at 16.00hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 16.05hrs. which is 5 minutes after the service of the objector. The objector requested that the gap may be increased at least 10 minutes.

Advocate appearing for the applicant stated that the destination of applied route is different.

5. Sri Dinesh Kumar Periwal, owner of vehicle No.OD01-3787 is represented by Advocate Sri K.C.Das. He stated that earlier, this objector had applied on the same time i.e. to depart from Kalipada at 19.30hrs. but STA has not considered the case of this objector. Hence, the objector may be given time to depart Kalipada at 19.30hrs. as he is a senior operator.
6. The owner of vehicle No.OD01K-4204 is represented by Advocate Sri K.C.Das. He stated that the service of this objector is plying as alter service of vehicle No.OD01-3787 (who is objector of this item vide sl.no.5). The objection is same.
7. Sri Bijay Kumar Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OD01S-2429 is represented by Advocate Sri K.C.Das. He stated that the objector is plying his bus on the route Chumki to Gopalpur and his service departing Kalipada at 21.00hrs. whereas the applicant has

applied to depart Kalipadaat 19.30hrs. He requested that the applicant may be given time after his service.

This may be verified and considered.

202. ROUTE – GARIA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA JAGATSINGHPUR, CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) AND BACK, SUSANTA KUMAR JENA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05AW2436.

Applicant is present.

There is one objection filed by Sri Sunil Kumar Padhi, owner of vehicle No.OD05AR-9439 represented by Advocate Sri D.B.Das. He stated that there is clash of time at Cuttack. The service of this objector is departing Cuttack at 12.10hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Cuttack at 12.10hrs. which is same. Hence, he requested that the application of the applicant may not be considered.

Applicant has submitted a written statement wherein he has stated that his vehicle is latest 2020 model vehicle. Since the route and slots applied by him on 1.6.2020 has been given to another vehicle No.OD05AR-9439, his pending application may be considered in vacant slots 12 and 76 Sabhamul to Cuttack and Bhubaneswar in rationalized timings.

This may be verified and considered.

203. ROUTE – GANDAKUL TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA NUAPOLA, BALIA AND BACK, PARESH KUMAR NANDI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD21L3605.

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

There is an objection filed by Sri Susanta Kumar Jena, owner of vehicle No.OD05AW-2436. The objector is the applicant in sl.no.202. He stated that the applicant has applied in same route. Since, the applicant has applied through e-mail, his case may not be considered.

Since the applicant has applied in exact route applied by the objector, this should be verified.

21

Ari A.K.Behera, Advocate appearing for the applicant stated that he will submit a written application mentioning the slot no. etc.

204. ROUTE – BARBIL TO SORO VIA GHASIPURA, ANANDAPUR AND BACK, BIRA BHADRA SAHOO, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR09Q5442.

Applicant is represented by his son Sri Ranjan Kumar Sahu. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

205. ROUTE – BANSPAL TO BALASORE VIA ANANDAPUR, CHHENAPADI AND BACK, TAPASI CHAKRABARTY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR04L0885.

Applicant is absent. This is alter service of applicant of sl.no.206.

Following objectors have given their objection as follows:

1. Sri Ganesh Chandra Jena, owner of vehicle No.OD01V-2288 is represented by Advocate Mr. K.Mohammad. He stated that there is clash time from Soro to Anandpur. The service of this objector is departing Soro at 6.26hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart Soro at 6.10hrs. which is 16 minutes ahead of his service. At Todigadia, the service of this objector departs at 6.41hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Todigadia at 6.38hrs. which is 3 minutes ahead of the service of objector. Hence, the objector requested that the applicant may be given time after his service.
2. Sri Ajay Kumar Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OR01K-9777 is represented by Advocate Shri D.B.Das. He stated that this objector is operating his service from Baripada to Keonjhar. There is clash of time from Soro to Keonjhar and also at Khaira. The service of objector is departing Soro at 6.30hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Soro at 6.10hrs. which is 20 minutes ahead of the service of objector. Similarly, the service of objector departs Khaira at 7.35hrs. and the applicant has proposed to depart Khaira at 7.08hrs. which is 27 minutes ahead of the service of this objector. Hence, he has requested

2

that the applicant may be given time after the service of this objector. The Advocate appearing for this objector stated that the applicant is obstructing his service to ply from Soro to Keonjhar. Necessary FIR will be filed against the applicant after due verification.

3. Smt. Haimabati Nayak, owner of vehicle No.OD01Q-2627 stated that she is plying her service on the route Balasore to Kupari via Khantapada, Bahanaga, Soro, Khaira and back. Her service is departing Balasore at 6.00hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Balasore at 4.40hrs. Hence she has requested that the applicant may be given time to depart Balasore at 4.00hrs.

206. **ROUTE –** BANSPAL TO BALASORE VIA ANANDAPUR, CHHENAPADI AND BACK, HAREKRUSHNA PANDA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR05AH8562.

Applicant is present. He stated that this is alter service of applicant of sl.no.205.

The objector Sri Ganesh Chandra Jena, owner of vehicle No. OD01V-2288 is represented by Advocate Mr. K.Mohammad and Sri Ajaya Kumar Sahu, owner of vehicle No. OR01K-9777 is represented by Advocate D.B.Das. They have raised same objection what they have given in sl.no. 205 (alter service of sl.no.206). Besides, following objectors have also given their objection:

1. Sri Debabrata Bhuyan, owner of vehicle No.OD02N-6075 is represented by Advocate Sri S.S.Mishra. He stated that there is clash of time from Keonjhar to Chhenapadi. The departure time of objector at Keonjhar is 8.50hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart Keonjhar at 8.40hrs. which is 10 minutes ahead of the service of objector. Moreover the route applied by the applicant is covering 160kms. on rationalised route. He further stated that the applicant has applied TP as ordinary service. Since the route applied by the applicant is more than 160 kms, he should apply to ply his service as express service.

2. There is an online objection given by Sri Haimabati Nayak, owner of vehicle No.OD01Q-2627. She stated that the departure time of the applicant OR04L0885 at Balasore is clashing with her vehicle No.OD01Q2627 which may be advanced and the applicant may be allowed to depart Balasore at 4.00hrs.

Applicant stated that the above three objectors i.e. owner of vehicle No.OR01K-9777, OR01V-2288 and OD01Q-2627 are not plying from Soro till Keonjhar. This should be verified.

207. **ROUTE –** JAJPUR TOWN TO BENISAGAR VIA DHENKIKOTE, PATNA AND BACK, ABHISEK SAHU, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR19G6321.

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

There is an objection filed by Sri Soumarendra Kumar Mohanty, owner of vehicle No.OD11J-1790. He stated that he is plying his service on the route Tata mines to GuhalDangiri via Ghotagaon, Karanjia, Benisagar. He stated that there is clash of time at Ghatagon point. His service is departing Ghatagaon at 9.06hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Ghatagaon at 9.08hrs. just 2 minutes after his service. The applicant has proposed jumping time at Karanjia. The service of this objector is departing Karanjia at 10.50hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Karanjia at 10.37hrs. Hence, the objector requested that the applicant may be given time after 30 minutes of his service at Ghatagaon, so that the applicants' service will not overtake his vehicle at Karanjia.

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

208. **ROUTE –** CHAMPUA TO DUBURI VIA DHENKIKOTE, GHATGAON AND BACK, SANJULATA BARIK, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD09S3619.

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

209. **ROUTE –** MANBIR TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA KARANJIA, THAKURMUNDA AND BACK, RANJAN KUMAR MOHALA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD11D3792.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that this is alter service of sl.no.210.

21

Following vehicle owners have given their objections.

1. Sri Ram Chandra Mohapatra, owner of vehicle No.OD11C-2799 is represented by Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. He stated that this objector is plying his service on the route Solepela to Puri. He stated that at Rairangpur, there is clash of time. The service of this objector is departing Rairangpur at 21.30hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Rairangpur at 21.15hrs. just 15 minutes ahead of his service. Further, he stated that the applicant has applied to operate his service via Bisoi. Hence, the applicant may be given in direct route from Rairangpur to Karanjia via Jashipur without touching Bisoi after the service of this objector.
2. Sri Tushar Mohapatra, owner of vehicle No.OD11F-7299 has also stated that the objection raised by the objector Sri Ram Chandra Mohapatra, owner of vehicle No.OD11C-2799 will be treated as objection of this objector.
3. Sri Saktidhar Das, owner of vehicle No.OD11J-3464 is represented by Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. He stated that at Bhubaneswar his service is departing at 21.17hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Bhubaneswar at 21.45hrs. which is 28 minutes after the service of this objector. Though the applicant's proposed time is after the service of this objector at Bhubaneswar point, but at Jashipur, the timing given by the applicant is overtaking. The common corridor is from Bhubaneswar to Jashipur. He requested that the applicant may be given clash free time. Advocate appearing for this objector will submit the objection in writing within two days.
4. Sri Jyotirmaya Behera, son of Lalit Behera, owner of vehicle No.OD11P-9699 stated that at Rairangpur there is clash of timing. The service of this objector is departing Rairangpur at 21.30hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Rairangpur at 21.15hrs. which is 15 minutes ahead of his service. Further objector stated that the stoppage applied by the applicant at Bisoi

may be deleted and the applicant may be given time after his service.

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

210. ROUTE – MANBIR TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA KARANJIA, THAKURMUNDA AND BACK, RANJAN KUMAR MAHALA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD11E3792.

This is alter service of sl.no.209 and observations made above are same.

211. ROUTE – KEONJHAR TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA BHAGAMUNDA, BRAHMANIPAL AND BACK, MANORANJAN MISHRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR09G7578.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the route is not coming under rationalized route. Following vehicle owners have raised their objections.

1. Smt. Shantilalta Choudhury, owner of vehicle No.OD04Q-0025 is represented by Advocate Sri S.S.Mishra. He stated that the service of this objector is plying on the route Keonjhar to Bhubaneswar and back via Panadapada, Harichandanpur, Brahmanipal, Duburi, Chandikhole and Cuttack. The timing applied by the applicant is clashing with entire route of objector from Keonjhar to Bhubaneswar. The service of objector is departing Keonjhar at 5.05hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Keonjhar at 4.45hrs. which is 20 minutes ahead of the service of this objector. Though the applicant applied to depart Keonjhar at 20 minutes gap before the service of this objector, but on the way i.e. stoppages at Harichandanpur, Brahmanipal, Duburi and Chandikhole, the gap is reduced to 12,7,6,2 minutes respectively. Besides, the applicants' proposed reaching time at Cuttack is 4 minutes after the reaching time of this objector though the applicant's proposed departure time from Keonjhar is 20 minutes gap before the service of this objector. The objector stated that TP may not be considered in favour of the vehicle of the applicant as the route Bhubaneswar to Keonjhar

2

via Duburi is under rationalization process. If, TP will be considered in favour of the applicant, then it may be considered after the service of this objector.

2. Sri Bichitrananda Mohanty, owner of vehicle No.OR01R-7144 is represented by Advocate Sri S.S.Mishra. He stated that the service of this objector is plying on the route Cuttack to Keonjhar via Jajpur Road, Panikoili and Chandikhole. There is clash of time in entire route. The service of this objector is departing Keonjhar at 4.45hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Keonjhar at 4.45hrs. which is exact time of this objector. Besides, the objectors' service will reach Cuttack at 10.30hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to reach Cuttack at 9.46hrs. which is 44 minutes before the service of this objector. The objector stated that TP may not be considered in favour of the vehicle of the applicant as the route Bhubaneswar to Keonjhar via Duburi is under rationalization process. If, TP will be considered in favour of the applicant, then it may be considered after the service of this objector.

This may be examined and considered subject to verification of clash free time. If the applicant has applied in rationalised route which is under process, this may not be considered.

212. ROUTE – BHADRAK TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA BHANDARIPOKHARI, CHANDIKHOLE AND BACK, DURGA PRASAD PALAK, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD22R4427.

Applicant is absent.

There is one objection filed by Sri Anshuman Chiranjeeb, owner of vehicle No.OD01Q-3727 represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the route is under rationalization process. Applicant may not be granted TP. Besides, he is stated that there is clash of time at Bhadrak point. The service of this objector is departing Bhadrak at 16.50hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 16.49hrs. just one minute ahead of his service. Though the applicant has proposed to leave Bhadrakh at 1 minutes ahead of

Q

the service of this objector, but reaches Bhubaneswar after 10minutes of this objector.

This may be examined and considered subject to verification of clash free time. If the applicant has applied in rationalized route which is under process, this may not be considered.

213. ROUTE – BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO NANDAPUR VIA BHANDARIPOKHARI, DHAMNAGAR AND BACK, PRAFULLA CHANDRA KAR, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD22N5657.

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

1. Pranati Samal, owner of vehicle No.OR22D-2977 is represented by Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. He stated that the service of this objector in its up trip departs Bhubaneswar at 4.30hrs. and arrives Aradi at 10.10hrs whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Bhubaneswar at 4.00hrs. and arrive Nandapur 9.15hrs. and thereby will operate ahead of the service of objector from Bhubaneswar to Aradi. Hence he requested that the applicant may be given time after her service.
2. Sri Dillip Kumar Biswal, owner of vehicle No.OD22G-9808 is represented by Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. He stated that the service of this objector is departing Aradi at 16.00hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart Aradi at 15.50hrs. which is just 10 minutes ahead of the service of this objector up to Dhusuri which is about 17kms. Hence, the objector requested that the applicant may be given time after his service.
3. Madhusmita Barik, owner of vehicle No.OD05AU-0199 is represented by her representative Shri Manish Barik. He stated that his service is operating on the route Bhubaneswar to Bhadrak and Bhubaneswar to Cuttack and back. He stated that, in up trip her service is departing Bhubaneswar at 4.00 hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Bhubaneswar at 4.00hrs. which is same time. Similarly, the applicant has proposed to leave Cuttack in 5 minutes ahead of her service. Further, this objector

9

stated that since the route is under rationalisation process, the applicant may not be given permit.

Advocate appearing for applicant stated that the route applied by the applicant is not covering rationalised route. He stated that earlier permit have been given as it is not touching Bhadrak and T.P. may be granted adjusting the timing.

This may be examined and considered subject to verification of clash free time and also whether the route applied by the applicant is coming under rationalised route.

214. ROUTE – BARGARH TO BHADRAK VIA ANGUL, DHENKANAL AND BACK, SAGAR KUMAR, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02T5225.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. There is an objection filed by Sri Partha Sarathi Mohapatra, owner of vehicle No.OD22D-6749 represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that there is clash of time from Bhadrak to Cuttack. The service of this objector is departing Bhadrak at 8.31hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart Bhadrak at 8.30hrs. which is 1 minute ahead of the service of this objector. Common corridor is from Bhadrak to Manguli covering about 100kms. Moreover, the route applied by the applicant is covering major portion of rationalized route i.e. from Bhadrak to Cuttack.

This may be examined and considered subject to verification of clash free time and also whether the route applied by the applicant is coming under rationalized route.

215. ROUTE – JAYANAGAR TO BARIPADA VIA BHADRAK, MARKONA AND BACK, GHANASHYAM PRADHAN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD04J3845.

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

1. Susama Rani Biswal, owner of vehicle No.OD01AE-0888 is represented by Advocate Sri D.B.Das. He stated that the objector is plying her service on the route Bhubaneswar to Balasore via



Bhadrak, Panikoili, Chandikhol and back. The common corridor is from Balasore to Bhadrak. He stated that the time gap of both the services i.e. service of objector and applicant is only merely 3 minutes at Balasore. The service of objector is departing Balasore at 4.05hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Balasore at 4.08hrs. Moreover, the route applied by the applicant is under rationalization process. Hence, he requested that the TP may be considered in favour of applicants' vehicle. If considered, there should be adequate gap between the services of objector and applicant.

2. Pranati Nalini Samantray, owner of vehicle No.OD05G-7799 stated that at Baripada, there is clash of time. Her service is departing Baripada at 14.00hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Baripada at 14.00hrs. which is same timing. Moreover, the route applied by the applicant is under rationalization process. Hence, she has requested that the permit may not be considered in favour of the vehicle of the applicant.

The Advocate appearing for applicant stated that the timing given by applicant at Baripada may be revised. Further, he stated that the applicant has applied in an interior route for the convenience of travelling public.

3. Sri Sitikanta Panda, owner of vehicle No.OD05AH-8867 stated that at Bhadrak, there is clash of time. His service is departing Bhadrak at 8.40hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart Bhadrak at 8.39hrs. just one minute ahead of the service of objector.
4. Sri Mayadhar Prusty, owner of vehicle No.OD05S-3199 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.Rao. He stated that the route applied by the applicant is covering under rationalised route. Besides, this objector stated that the departure timing of his service at Bhadrak is 8.45hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Bhadrak at 8.39hrs. which is just 6 minutes ahead of the service of this objector.

Q

This should not be considered as the route applied by the applicant is under process of rationalisation of timings.

216. ROUTE – ERAM TO PARADEEP COLLEGE VIA CHANDIKHOLE, KRUSHNADASPUR AND BACK, SUSHREE SANGEETA LENKA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR05AK5315.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri S.S.Mishra. He stated that the applicant has applied in category 'C' in slot No.55 from Paradeep. Following vehicle owners have submitted their objections.

1. Sri Pradip Kumar Das, owner of vehicle No.OD22H-3999 stated that he is operating his service on the route Balasore to Bhubaneswar via Bhadrak and back. His service is departing Bhadrak at 8.05hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Bhadrak at 8.04hrs. which is just 1 minute ahead of his service. This objector has requested that the applicant may be given permit in modified time.
2. Sri Anil Kumar Kar, owner of vehicle No.OD01C-4180 stated that there is clash of time at Ananatpur at 7.17hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart Anantpurat 6.48hrs. which is 29 minutes ahead of his service. The service of this objector is plying under ordinary service in local route.

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

217. ROUTE – DHAMARA TO ROURKELA VIA JAJPUR ROAD, KAMAKHYANAGAR AND BACK, KANHU SAMAL, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02AM7907.

Applicant is absent. This is alter service of sl.no.218. Following vehicle owners have submitted their objections.

1. Sri Kishore Kumar Mohapatra, owner of vehicle No.OD22E-3772 and OR22E-7772 is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that this objector is operating his above two vehicles on the route Udaipur to Rourkela (vehicle No. OD22E-3772) and his another vehicle (OR22E-7772) is plying on the route Chandanipal

to Rourkela. His vehicle No. OD22E-3772 is departing Bhadrak at 21.05 hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Bhadrak at 21.00hrs. which is just 5 minutes ahead of his service. Similarly, his another vehicle No. OR22E-7772 is departing Dhamara at 18.05hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Dhamra at 18.00hrs. which is also 5 minutes ahead of the service of this objector. Hence he has requested that the applicant may be given time after his services at Bhadrak and Dhamara respectively.

2. Sri Prasanta Perival, owner of vehicle No.OR01M-0787 stated that he is operating his vehicle on the route Udayapur to Rourkela via Balasore, Soro, Bhadrakh, Panikoili, Kamakhyanagar and back. His service is departing Soro at 20.05hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart Soro at 20.00hrs which is just 5 minutes ahead of his service. Similarly, the service of this objector is departing Bhadrak at 21.05hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Bhadrak at 21.00hrs. which is just 5 minutes ahead of the service of this objector. Hence, he requested that the application of the applicant may be rejected.
3. Sri Durga Perival, owner of vehicle INo.OD01V-1087 stated that he is operating his service on the route Rourkela to Udayapur via Bhuban, Duburi and back. He stated that at Panikoili, his service is departing at 22.35hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Panikoili at 22.30hrs. which is 5 minutes ahead of his service. Similarly, the departure time from Jajpur of this objector is 22.56hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart Jajpur at 22.50hrs. which is 6 minutes ahead of his service. The clash of time is will continue up to Rourkela. Hence, the objector stated that the application of the applicant may be rejected.

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



218. ROUTE – DHAMARA TO ROURKELA VIA JAJPUR ROAD, KAMAKHYANAGAR AND BACK, KANHU SAMAL, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02AM7909.

This is alter service of sl.no.217. The observations made in sl.no.217 is same.

219. ROUTE – ANGUL TO BALASORE VIA BHADRAK AND BACK, MINATI SATAPATHY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD01AE4996.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. There is an objection filed by Sri Rudra Narayan Sahu, owner of vehicle No.OR04N-1080. He stated that the route applied by the applicant is under process of rationalization of timings. Hence, he requested that the applicant may not be considered for permit. Besides, there is clash of time at Kamakhyanagar in up trip. His service is departing Kamakhyanagar at 7.55hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Kamakhyanagar at 7.48hrs. which is 7 minutes ahead of his service. If, the case of applicant will be considered, then applicant may be allowed time after his service.

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

220. ROUTE – SAMBALPUR TO SUNDARGARH VIA RENGALI, JHARSUGUDA AND BACK, JITENDRA TANDIA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD23J9164.

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

There is an objection filed by RashmitaPati, owner of vehicle No.OD15H-4088. She stated that she is plying her service on the route from Kulgaon to Jharsuguda. Her service is departing Sambalpur at 9.45hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Sambalpur at 9.45hrs. which is exact time of this objector. Hence she has requested that the applicant may be given in modified timing after her service.

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



221. ROUTE – DHARMAGARH TO JHARSUGUDA VIA CHUDAPALI, BOLANGIR AND BACK, AKSHYA KUMAR NANDA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD08M3899.

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

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

222. ROUTE – TAPARIA TO ROURKELA VIA DUDUKA, LEPHRIPADA AND BACK, AJAYA KUMAR KAR, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD33K3374.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the applicant has applied in slot no.46 from Sundargarh and slot No.88 from Rourkela.

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

223. ROUTE – CHANDAHANDI TO ROURKELA VIA BARGARH, BURLA AND BACK, ANKAN MISHRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD15G0200.

Applicant is present. This is alter service of sl.no.224.

There is an objection filed by Sri Sukhjinder Singh, owner of vehicle No.OD16G-4334. He stated that he is operating his service from Rourkela to Rajgangpur. His service is departing Rourkela at 16.30hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Rourkela at 16.27hrs. just 3 minutes ahead of his service. He further stated that there are two more vehicles are plying in slot time after 5 to 10 minutes of his service. He further stated that the proposed route applied by the applicant are not in any vacant slots. Hence, he requested that if the application of applicant will be considered, then the applicant may be allowed time after his service.

This may be examined and considered subject to verification of clash free time and also it may be verified whether the applicant has applied in any vacant slots.

224. ROUTE – CHANDAHANDI TO ROURKELA VIA BARGARH, BURLA AND BACK, DOLAGOBINDA SWAIN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD15G0195.

This is alter service of sl.no.223. The objection and observations made above are same.

Q.

225. ROUTE – GUNDIADIHI TO ROURKELA VIA KINJIRKELA, SUNDARGARH AND BACK, GYANARANJAN HOTA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD16H5566.

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

Following vehicle owners have submitted their objections.

1. Sri P.Lenka, owner of vehicle No.OD15L-3474 stated that the applicant has applied just before timing of the service of this objector. He further stated that the applicant has applied to operate his service as ordinary service, but has proposed mentioning only few stoppages. Since the applied route of applicant is covering more than 160 kms., it should be express service.
2. Md.Zahir, owner of vehicle No.OD16D-5747 is represented by Advocate Shri B.N.Prasad. He stated that this objector is plying his service on the route Rajgangpur to Rourkela and back (4 RT) and Rajgangpur to Kutra and back. He stated that in down trip, the vehicle of this objector departs Rourkela at 12.30hrs. towards Rajgangpur whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Rourkela at 12.29hrs. just 1 minute ahead of the service of this objector. Hence this objector requested that the applicant may be given time after his service.

Advocate appearing for applicant stated that the applicant has applied in vacant slots i.e. slot No.36 from Sundargarh and slot No.83 from Rourkela. The nature of service may be modified as express instead of ordinary.

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

226. ROUTE – SUNDARGARH TO SAMBALPUR VIA JHARSUGUDA, RENGALI AND BACK, ADESHI BARIK, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD23D6096.

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

There is an objection filed by Sri Rampukar Ray, owner of vehicle No.OR23F-3115 represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty.



He stated that the applicants' proposed time at 10.30hrs. from Sambalpur in slot No.79 has already been allotted to his service. Hence, applicant may not be considered for T.P.

This may be verified and considered subject to verification of timings allotted to the service of the above objector.

227. ROUTE – SUNDARGARH TO SAMBALPUR VIA JHARSUGUDA, RENGALI AND BACK, SAGAR RAI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR23E4896.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the applicant has applied in slots no.27, 119 and 188 from Sundargarh and slots no.63 and 147 from Sambalpur and slot no.171 from Jharsuguda. He stated that portion of route from Sundargarh to Jharsuguda may be deleted.

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

228. ROUTE – LAIDA TO ROURKELA VIA BAMURA, BARGAON AND BACK, MD GYASUDDIN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR16D7557.

Applicant is present. There is an objection filed by Shoaeb Alam, owner of vehicle No.OR16C-6886 represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that this is rationalized route and the applied route of applicant is covering 70% of rationalized route i.e. from Bargaon to Rourkela which is 71kms. He stated that earlier the applicant had applied on the self same route vide sl.no.267 which had been heard on 16.3.2020 by the permit grant committee meeting of STA and the same has been rejected on the ground the portion of the route is rationalized.

It should be verified and applicant should apply in any vacant slot.

229. ROUTE – BUNDIA TO SAMBALPUR VIA BUXI CHOUK, JHARSUGUDA AND BACK, ARADHANA SINGH, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD23C8608.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the applicant has applied in slot No.18, 107 from Jharsuguda, slot No.41 and 186 from Sambalpur.

Q

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

230. ROUTE – THEBRA TO SAMBALPUR VIA JHARSUGUDA AND BACK, TRILOCHAN PRASAD JAISWAL, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR23E0044.

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

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

231. ROUTE – JHARSUGUDA TO SAMBALPUR VIA KANAKTORA CHHAKA, BHIKAMPALI AND BACK, PADMABATI BEHERA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD23C7596.

Applicant is represented by her husband Sri Suresh Kumar Behera.

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

232. ROUTE – BERHAMPUR TO TIKILIPARA VIA BOUDH, KIAKATA AND BACK, PURNABASI ROUT, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD07AA2288.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Mr. K.Mohammad. He stated that this is alter service of sl.no.233 and he is appearing for both of the applicants.

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

233. ROUTE – BERHAMPUR TO TIKILIPARA VIA BOUDH, KIAKATA AND BACK, PANCHANAN ROUT, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD07D8822.

This is alter service of sl.no.232. The observations made in sl.no.232 will be same.

234. ROUTE – BODEN TO ROURKELA VIA BARGARH, ATTABIRA AND BACK, SUDHIRA BEHERA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD15G2395.

Applicant is absent.

There is an objection filed by Sri Inderjit Singh, owner of vehicle No.OD16-3697 represented by his son Shri Sukhjinder Singh. He stated that the applicant has applied in same departure time from

2

Rourkela. The service of this objector is departing Rourkela at 17.00hrs. whereas the applicant has also proposed to depart Rourkela at 17.00hrs. The clash of time is from Rourkela to Kutra which is a distance of 49kms. He further stated that there is another vehicle No.OR16D-3066 has been granted permit in slot No.125. This objector has given an online objection mentioning the same fact.

This is alter service of sl.no.13 which has been heard on 15.12.2020. Both should be considered together.

235. ROUTE – SAMBALPUR TO KANTABANJI VIA JHANKARPALI, DHULUSARA AND BACK, SUKANTA MISHRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD17U6726.

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

236. ROUTE – MALIBASA TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA TARATA, BARAPARHA AND BACK, ASIT KUMAR DAS, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05AT9390.

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

237. ROUTE – ULUNDA TO BAGHDA VIA CHITRADA, NICHUAPADA AND BACK, SUBRAT KUMAR BEHERA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR11K1017.

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

238. ROUTE – ROURKELA TO RAJKANIKA VIA BANRAPAL, KHUNTUNI AND BACK, KHAGESWAR MALLICK, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR05AN0287.

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



239. **ROUTE –** PATTAMUNDAI TO CHANDILI VIA RAYAGADA, LAXMIPUR AND BACK, DEEPIKA JENA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD04M6003.

Applicant is represented by his brother Sri Ramesh Chandra Rout. This is alter service of sl.no.240. There is no objection. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

240. **ROUTE –** PATTAMUNDAI TO CHANDILI VIA RAYAGADA, LAXMIPUR AND BACK, DEEPIKA JENA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD04M6001.

This is alter service of 239. The observations given in sl.no.239 will be the same.

241. **ROUTE –** BAGHILO TO CUTTACK VIA NISHINTAKOILI, SALEPUR, SUDHIR KUMAR SATAPATHY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR09K1857.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the applicant has applied in slot no.15 and 104 from Nischintkoili and slot No.40, 100 and 98 from Cuttack. Previously another vehicle of this applicant i.e. No.OR02K-0068 was plying on the said timing.

There is an objection filed by Sri Ramesh Chandra Das, owner of vehicle No.OR05AT-3733 and No.OR09C-6063 represented by Advocate Sri S.S.Mishra. He stated that since the applicant has applied on his own slot, applicant may be granted permit to which this objector has no objection.

This may be verified and considered subject to verification of vacant slots.

242. **ROUTE –** KARANJA TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA NAGNAPUR, NARENDRAPUR AND BACK, ANANT KISHOR SAHOO, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD29E1914.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that he has applied in slot No.123 from Nischintkoili and slot No.192 from Cuttack. These slots are new slots.

Following objectors have submitted objection.

1. Tanuja Bhuyan, owner of vehicle No.OR05J-2757 is represented by Advocate Sri S.S.Mishra. He stated that this objector is plying her service on the route Korua to Cuttack and back via Asureswar, Nischintkoili, Salipur. He stated that earlier the slot

9

applied by the applicant was allotted to vehicle No.OR05Q-7905. He further stated that the entire last trip of the service of this objector will be affected. Hence, this objector has requested that the applicant may be given in any vacant slots.

Advocate appearing for the applicant stated that the applicant has applied in vacant slots after the service of the objector.

2. Sri Ajay Kumar Mallick, owner of vehicle No.OD05AT-6995 is represented by Advocate Sri S.S.Mishra. He stated that the objector is plying his service on the route Bhubaneswar to Khamagaon and back via Cuttack, Salepur, Asureswar in slot No.35-A in the up trip and slot No.126-A in the down trip in the Cuttack to Pattamundai via Salepur, rationalized time under category-A. He stated that the applicant has proposed to depart before his service. His service is departing Korua at 11.30hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Korua at 10.50 which is 40 minutes ahead of his service. Hence this objector suggested that the applicant may be given in vacant slots i.e. 64 and 169.

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

243. ROUTE – ROURKELA TO PARADIP VIA CHANDIKHOLE, KRUSHNADASPUR AND BACK, BRAHMANANDA PRADHAN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR22D5454.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the applicant may be allowed to curtail the route and to ply on the route Rajgangpur to Bhubaneswar instead of Rajgangpur to Paradeep.

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



244. ROUTE – DAHALPUR TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA NARENDRAPUR, NEMALO AND BACK, MANORANJAN PANDA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR05AD3406.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri S.Mishra. He stated that the applicant has applied in slots no.56 and 163 in down trip and 79,185 in up trip in category-A. These slots are earlier allotted to vehicle No.OR05U-4679 which is in the name of the father of this applicant. Besides, the applicant has given a brand new vehicle.

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

245. ROUTE – OLAVAR TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA JAJPUR TOWN, KUAKHIA AND BACK, MRS PRANATI NAYAK, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD04N4044.

Applicant is absent. There is a written objection given by Smt. Sandyarani Das, owner of vehicle No.OD04H-8989. She has stated that she is operating her service on the route Dihakula to Cuttack via Jajpur Town and Baruhan. This route is under process of rationalization of timings. She stated that her service is departing Jajpur Town at 6.20hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Jajpur Town at 6.04hrs. which is just 16 minutes ahead of her service. Besides, this objector further stated that her service is departing Cuttack at 9.30hrs. whereas another bus bearing No.OD02BG-4751 has applied TP in which the proposed departure time of this vehicle from Cuttack is 6.25hrs. which is 5 minutes ahead of the service of this objector. Hence she has requested to consider her grievance. Moreover, the route applied by the applicant is under process of rationalization of timings.

This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time as well as whether the applicant has applied in rationalized route which is under process. If so, this should not be considered.



246. ROUTE – CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) TO KAKATPUR VIA ADASPUR, NIALI AND BACK, PUSPANJALI MISHRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR02AR0045.

Applicant is represented by her son Sri Utkal Ku. Mishra. He stated that he has applied in vacant slots No.12 in departure time 7.35AM and 41 in up trip and slots no.34 and 58 in down trip. All the slots applied by him are vacant slots.

There is one objection given by Sri Ramesh Chandra Mallick, owner of vehicle No.OR05X-2199 represented by Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. He stated that slot no.24 is not vacant. The said slot has been allotted to vehicle No.OD05M-6199.

This may be verified whether the applicant has applied in vacant slots. If so, then it may be considered subject to verification of vacant slots.

247. ROUTE – JOTA TO CHOUDWAR VIA ADASPUR, PHULNAKHARA AND BACK, DAYANIDHI SWAIN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02BJ3751.

Applicant is absent.

Some owners have filed objection in a group which is not considered. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time and vacant slots.

248. ROUTE – KONARK TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA NIMAPADA AND BACK, AMIT KUMAR BINAKAR, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR02BX0421.

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

249. ROUTE – CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) TO KAKATPUR VIA PIPILI, PURI AND BACK, KABITA MOHANTY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR05AD5257.

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



250. ROUTE – CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) TO ASTARANGA VIA ADASPUR, NIALI AND BACK, PUSPANJALI MISHRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR05AV9969.

Applicant is represented by her son Sri Utkal Kumar Mishra. He stated that he has applied in up trip in slot No.7 and 36 and in down trip, slot No.21 and 52.

There is an objection filed by Sri Ramesh Chandra Mallick, owner of vehicle No.OR02X-2199 is represented by Advocate Sri A.K.Behera. He stated that in up trip from Cuttack, slot no.7 has been allotted to the vehicle No.OR05M-6199.

This may be verified whether the applicant has applied in vacant slots. If so, then it may be considered subject to verification of vacant slots.

251. ROUTE – CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) TO ASTARANGA VIA ADASPUR, NIALI AND BACK, ARATI PARIDA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02AQ0584.

Applicant withdrew her application.

252. ROUTE – BHANJANAGAR TO BARIPADA VIA-NAYAGARH, BHUBANESWAR, BALASORE AND BACK, RAY PRAMOD KUMAR, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05H7799.

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

1. Pranati Nalini Samantra, owner of vehicle No.OD02AS-7799 is represented by Advocate Mr. K.Mohammad. He stated that the timing proposed by the applicant is very irrational. He stated that the applicant has proposed to depart from Baripada at 20.30hrs. and arrive at Balasore at 20.02hrs. which is quite impossible. Besides, there is clash of time from Baripada to Khurda. The service of this objector is departing Baripada at 20.24hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Baripada at 20.30hrs. which is just 6 minutes after the service of this objector. The gap may be suitably increased.
2. Baijayantimala Nayak, owner of vehicle No.OD02BG-7857 (alter service of OD02AS-7799) is represented by Advocate Mr. K. Mohammad. He stated that this objector is operating her service as

Q

alter service of vehicle No.OD02AS-7799. The objections given in sl.no.1 of this serial mentioned above are same.

3. Sri Braja Kishore Agarwalla, owner of vehicle No.OD11-1041 stated that there is clash of time from Baripada to Cuttack. His service is departing Baripada at 20.35hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart Baripada at 20.30hrs. which is just 5 minutes ahead of the service of this objector. Th objector has requested that the applicant may be given time after his service from Baripada maintaining a cap of half-an-hour.

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

253. **ROUTE –** BHUBANESWAR TO KALTA VIA PANIKOILI, KEONJHAR AND BACK, JITEN KUMAR SINGH, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR02BC5353.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.Rao. He stated that this is alter service of OR02AK-8789 which is now operating as night service.

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

254. **ROUTE –** BAGHA SAHI TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA JAJPUR TOWN, BARUAN AND BACK, JAYANTA PATRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR04P2384.

Applicant is absent.

1. Sri Susil Kumar Debata-objector, owner of vehicle No.OR05P-0669 represented by Advocate Sri S.S.Mishra. He stated that there is clash of time from Jajpur Town to Bhubaneswar. The service of this objector is departing Jajpur Town at 5.20hrs. whereas the applicant has applied to depart Jajpur at 5.14hrs. just 6 minutes ahead of the service of this objector. Moreover the route from Bhubaneswar to Jajpur Town via Kuakhia, Baruan is under rationalization process. Hence, he has requested that the TP applied by the applicant may not be considered. If considered, then in the Up trip, the applicant may be allotted time 30 minutes after the service of this objector from Jajpur Town.

Q

2. There is another objection given by Sri Hrushikesh Panda, owner of vehicle No.OD04C-6627. He stated that he is operating his service on the route Kamalpur to Bhubaneswar via Jajpur and back. There is clash of time from Jajpur to Bhubaneswar. His service is departing Jajpur at 5.26hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to leave Jajpur at 5.10hrs. which is 16 minutes ahead of his service. Moreover the route from Bhubaneswar to Jajpur Town is under rationalization process. Hence, he has requested that the TP applied by the applicant may not be considered.
3. Smt. Krushna Kumari Mishra-objector, owner of vehicle No.OD04K-0092 has stated that she is operating her above service on the route Madhusudanpur to Bhubaneswar via Jajpur Town and back. Her service is departing Jajpur Town at 4.42hrs. in slot No.3, whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Jajpur Town at 5.14hrs. Further, this objector stated that the rationalisation of timing from Bhubaneswar to Jajpur is under process.

This may be verified whether the route applied by the applicant covers any portion of the rationalised route.

255. ROUTE – BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO SINGHPUR VIA CHANDIKHOLE, PANIKOILI AND BACK, DAYANIDHI SWAIN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02BG4751.

Applicant is absent. There is no objection. The route applied by the applicant is coming under the rationalization of timing process. Hence, this should not be considered.

256. ROUTE – PITHAGOLA TO PANIKOILI VIA DHAKOTHA, ANANDAPUR AND BACK, BIRENDRA JAMUDA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD04B1257.

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

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

257. ROUTE – PALASHAPALA TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA TAMKA, DUBURI AND BACK, JAMUDA SUPPLIERS, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD048157.

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

There is an objection filed by Sambit Kumar Rout, owner of vehicle No.OR04C-7591. He stated that in down trip at Cuttack, his service is arriving at 10.58hrs. and departing at 15.00. The proposed timing applied by the applicant at Cuttack and Chandikhol are same. Further, the objector stated that the rationalisation of timing on the route applied by the applicant is under process. Hence, the objector requested that the applicant's application may be considered after completion of rationalisation process and sufficient gap may be maintained. He suggested that the applicant may be given time after 5.00PM from Cuttack.

This may be verified whether the route applied by the applicant covers the portion of rationalised route. If so, this should not be considered.

258. ROUTE – BINJHARPUR TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA KUAKHIA, CHANDIKHOLE AND BACK, SUKANTA MOHANTY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05AV4060.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri S.S.Mishra. He stated that the applicant has applied in slot No.11 in down trip and slot No.55 in up trip.

Following two objectors have submitted their objections.

1. Sri Hrusikesh Panda, owner of vehicle No.OD04C-6627 stated that his service is departing Jajpur at 5.26hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Jajpur at 5.15hrs. which is 11 minutes ahead of the service of this objector. The common corridor is from Jajpur to Bhubaneswar which is 117kms. Further, he stated that since the route from Bhubaneswar to Jajpur is going for rationalisation of timings and now under process, the applicant may not be considered for new TP.
2. Smt. Krushna Kumari Mishra, owner of vehicle No.OD04K-0092 stated that she is operating her service on the route from Madhusudanpur to Bhubaneswar via Jajpur town and back. This objector stated that there is clash of time at Jajpur town to Bhubaneswar. Her service is departing Jajpur town at 4.42hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart just after 25

9

minutes of her service. Moreover, the route is under rationalisation process.

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

259. ROUTE – JAJPUR ROAD TO BARIPADA VIA KEONJHAR, SINGADA AND BACK, BAIJAYANTI SAHOO, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR11J1864.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the Sarangpur point may be deleted. Accordingly, proposed timing at Keonjhar will be 7.05hrs. instead of 7.48hrs.

There is a written objection given by Sri Soumendra Kumar Mohanty, owner of vehicle OD11J-1790. He stated that he is operating his service on the route Tata Mines to Guhaldangiri via Ghatagaon, Karanjia, Benisagar. He stated that the applicant has applied for permit without any valid fitness certificate and insurance certificate at the time of application. Besides, the applicant has applied to operate his vehicle before the timings of this objector at Duburi point.

It may be verified whether the applicant has applied for TP without valid F.C. and Insurance Certificate. If so, this may not be considered. Otherwise, this may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

260. ROUTE – BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO SINGHPUR VIA KUAKHIA, BARUAN AND BACK, JYOTI PRAKASH MALLICK, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05AP5597.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri S.S.Mishra. He stated that the applicant has applied in slot no.39 in up trip and slot no.133 in down trip.

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

261. ROUTE – BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO TANGABILLA VIA HARICHANDANPUR, GHATGAON AND BACK, DEEPAK KUMAR SAHOO, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD09E5721.

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



Following two objectors have submitted their objections.

1. Jyostnamayee Rout, owner of vehicle No.OD04J-1991 is represented by her husband Sri S.K.Rout. He stated that this objector is plying her service on the route Bhubaneswar to Keonjhar. He stated that there is clash of time at Bhubaneswar and Cuttack. The service of this objector is departing Bhubaneswar at 5.35hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Bhubaneswar at 6.00hrs. The departure time of the service of this objector at Cuttack is at 6.50hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Cuttack at 6.55hrs. Hence, the objector has requested that sufficient time gap may be maintained and applicant may be given time one hour gap after the service of this objector. This objector further stated that the route applied by the applicant is under process of rationalization of timings. Hence T.P. may not be considered in favour of the applicant till finalization of rationalization process.
2. Amarendra Nayak, owner of vehicle No.OD33F-0045 stated that he is operating his service on the route Bhubaneswar to Rairangpur via Cuttack, Chandikhole, Jajpur Road, Ghatagaon, Keonjhar, Karanjia and Jashipur and back. His service is departing Bhubaneswar at 5.55hrs, Cuttack 7.15, Chandikhole 8.30hrs., Ghatagaon 11.30hrs. and Dhenkikote at 11.45hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Bhubaneswar at 6.00hrs. which is 5 minutes after the service of this objector. Similarly, the applicant has proposed to depart Cuttack 6.55hrs. and Chandikhol 5.05hrs. which is 20 and 25 minutes ahead of the service of this objector. Further, this objector has requested that since the route is under rationalisation of time process, the TP may not be considered.

This may not be considered since the route is under rationalisation process.



262. **ROUTE** – BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO SINGHPUR VIA CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) AND BACK, SWAPNA SUNELIKA SAMAL, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD04L8010.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri S.S.Mishra. There is no objection.

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

263. **ROUTE** – BALASORE TO MUKHIGUDA VIA KHORDHA JN, NAYAGARH AND BACK, DEBABRATA PATNAIK, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02R7097.

Applicant is present. This is alter service of sl.no.264.

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

264. **ROUTE** – BALASORE TO MUKHIGUDA VIA KHORDHA JN, NAYAGARH AND BACK, DEBABRATA PATNAIK, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02R7297.

This is alter service of sl.no.263. This may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

265. **ROUTE** – KANTUNIA TO NARSINGH PUR VIA KANDAR PUR, CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) AND BACK, BISWESA KESHARI NANDA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05AV2244.

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

266. **ROUTE** – KAMALADIHA TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA JENAPADA, ATHAGARH AND BACK, JYOTIKANTA DASH, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05AW7209.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri S.S.Mishra. He stated that the applicant has applied in slot No.69 in down trip land slot No.84 in up trip in Cuttack-Athagarh rationalized route. He further stated that the applicant has applied in direct slots.

There is no objection. This may be considered together with sl.no.267.



267. ROUTE – KAMALADIHA TO CUTTACK (BADAMBADI) VIA BADAMBA, ATHAGARH AND BACK BICHITRA RANJAN BEHERA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05AQ4249.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the applicant has applied in slot no.59 from Narasinghpur and slot No.84 from Cuttack.

There is no objection. This may be considered together with sl.no.266.

268. ROUTE – ANGUL TO BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) VIA SANKARPUR, JATAMUNDIA AND BACK, JYOTIKANTA DASH, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05X6355.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri S.S.Mishra.

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

269. ROUTE – BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO SATAPADA VIA JAGANNATHAROAD, BRAHMAGIRI AND BACK, ASHOK KUMAR PARIDA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD02AW5484.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri H.P.Mohanty. He stated that the applicant has applied in slot No.2 from Bhubaneswar and slot No.274 from Puri.

Following vehicle owners have submitted their objections.

1. Sri Arup Kumar Prusty, owner of vehicle No.OD13F-0504 is represented by Advocate Sri A.N.Ray. He has filed written objection stating that the slot no.2 applied by the applicant is not vacant and therefore cannot be granted to the applicant. He further stated that the objectors' application is pending before the STA since 12.12.2019 for grant of permit from Bhubaneswar to Puri which was rejected by the STA on 11.05.2020. The objector challenged the rejection order passed by the STA before the hon'ble STAT. Further he stated that this has already been heard in STA meeting held on 14.12.2020.
2. Sriprasad Sinha, owner of vehicle No.OD13-3599 is represented by Advocate Sri R.P.Kar. He stated that this objector is plying his service on the route Bhubaneswar to Puri and back and Puri to Barang and back. The service of this objector departing Bhubaneswar at 5.30hrs.



whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 4.35hrs. Since in starting point the time gap is 55 minutes, but at Pipili it comes to 16 minutes which is ahead of the service of this objector. Further, he has stated that there is another vehicle bearing No.OD02BB-8684 which stands in the name of Arati Parida (wife of the applicant) had been allotted departure time at 4.45hrs. from Bhubaneswar, but instead of departing at 4.45hrs, her vehicle is departing at 5.15hrs. Hence the objector stated that the applicant and his wife are creating a monopoly on the route.

3. Sri P.K.Nayak, owner of vehicle No.OR13-5939 stated that at Satapada, there is clash of time. His service is departing Satapada at 3.00PM whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Satapada at 2.40PM. This objector has got one more bus which is departing Satapada at 2.30PM. He has stated that this route is not viable and requested that the route may be surveyed before consideration of the case of the applicant.

The above objections may be verified and considered subject to verification of vacant slots applied by the applicant.

270. ROUTE – BHUBANESWAR (BARAMUNDA) TO PURI MUNICIPALTY BUS STAND VIA KALPANA, PIPILI AND BACK, ARUP KUMAR PRUSTY, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD13F0504.

Applicant is present. He stated that since this case has already been heard in STA meeting, this should not be heard again as the STA is higher forum than this committee.

There is an objection filed by Sri Pravat Kumar Pradhan, owner of vehicle No.OR05AB-1683 represented by Advocate Sri H.P. Mohanty. He stated that since this is not heard, this should not be entertained. This should be considered together with sl.No.194.

271. ROUTE – GHANTESWAR TO PURI MUNICIPALTY BUS STAND VIA DUHURIA , NISCHINTAKOILI AND BACK, RAGHUNATH KAR, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD05G4349.

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

Q

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

272. ROUTE – BIJATALA TO BHUBANESWAR VIA KEONJHAR AND BACK, TAPAN KUMAR PARIDA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD11T-4415.

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

There is an objection given by Sri Satrugana Singh, owner of vehicle No.OD11S-3738. He stated that there is clash of time at Bisoi. The service of this objector is departing Bisoi at 7.05hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Bisoi at 7.24hrs. which is 19 minutes after the service of this objector. At Jashipur, the departure time is same. He has requested that as the applicant has not given the name of all stoppages, the time gap may be maintained.

The route applied by the applicant covers some portion of the rationalized route. This may be verified. If applicants' proposed route covers the portion of rationalized route, it should not be considered, otherwise the same may be considered subject to verification of clash free time.

273. ROUTE – KALIPADA TO BARGARH VIA PANIKOILI, CHANDIKHOLE AND BACK, SUSHAMA RANI BISWAL, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD01AH0888.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri D.B.Das. He stated that the applicant has applied in vacant route and also as alter service of OD01Y-1155. The vehicle of this applicant is a brand new vehicle.

Following vehicle owners have submitted their objections.

1. Shri Rajesh Kumar Periwal, owner of vehicle No.OR01S-3987 is represented by Advocate Mr. K. Mohammad. He stated that there is clash of time from Balasore to Bargarh. He stated that the timing proposed by the applicant is irrational. The applicant has proposed to depart Balasore at 10 minutes ahead of the service of this objector, but the suggested time gap at Bhadrakh, Chandikhole and Dhenkanal comes to 28minutes, 84 minutes and 87 minutes respectively. Then this

Q

objector requested that the gap at Balasore may be maintained. He further stated that in down trip, the applicant has proposed for earlier departure time from Bargarh which will affect the objectors' service.

2. Sri Bibhupada Das, owner of vehicle No.OR02BE-0043 is represented by Advocate Sri M.B.Rao. He stated that this objector is plying his service on the route Baripada to Bargarh via Balasore and Bhadrakh. The objectors' service is departing Balasore at 20.05hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart Balasore at 20.15hrs. which is just ten minutes after the service of this objector. He further stated that the applicants' proposed service is coming from Kalipada to Balasore covering a distance of about 60kms. is not required to halt at Balasore for more than 1 and ½ hours i.e. from 18.39hrs. to 20.15hrs. Hence, he has requested that if the applicants' service will be allowed Balasore arrival time at 20.00hrs. and departure 20.15hrs. instead of suggested 18.39hrs. and 20.15hrs., it will be beneficial to both the operators. Hence the halting time at Balasore may be given 15minutes.

But the Advocate appearing for the applicant stated that since the applicant has applied to operate his service as alter service of OD01Y-1155, the case of the applicant may be considered.

3. Smt. Krishna Jena, owner of vehicle No.OD01Q-2282 given written objection stating that she is operating her service on the route Balasore to Baliapal since long on the strength of permit issued by RTA, Balasore. Her service is departing from Baliapal at 17.15hrs. whereas the applicant has proposed to depart at 17.15hrs. which is exact time of the service of this objector. She further stated that since the applicant has proposed to operate his service as night service, the applicant may be given time after 20.00hrs. from Baliapal.

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

274. ROUTE – KALIPADA TO BARGARH VIA PANIKOILI, CHANDIKHOLE AND BACK, DEEP PRAKASH PERIWAL, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD01AD3787.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri K.C.Das. He stated that the applicant has applied to operate his vehicle as alter service of OD01B-6395. He further stated that the applicant has proposed to

2

operate his service on the route Choumukhi to Gopalpur via Balasore, Soro, Panikoili, Chandikhol, Cuttack, Bhubaneswar, Balugaon and Berhampur. But in Agenda note, the route has been wrongly mentioned as Kalipada to Bargarh via Panikoili, Chandikhole and back. This may be corrected.

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

275. ROUTE – BALASORE TO BOLANGIR VIA PANIKOILI, CUTTACK, ANGUL AND BACK, SHIBAM SHREE ATUL GANA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD01B3949.

Applicant is represented by Advocate Sri D.B.Das.

There is an objection given by Sri Rajesh Kumar Periwel, owner of vehicle No.OR01S-7187 represented by Advocate Mr. K. Mohammad. He stated that there is one alter service OD14N-8500 is plying on the route (alter service of OR01S-7187). The applicant has applied this permit as third permit with same timings in all stations covering the entire route of the objector. Hence, this objector has requested that the applicant may not be allowed to operate his service as third alter service.

Shi D.B.Das, Advocate appearing for the applicant stated that Mr. Rajesh Periwel, the objector is not operating his vehicle No.OR01S-7187 and the said vehicle has been currently declared off-road. He stated that the applicant may be given any clash free time.

Later, Sri D.B.Das, Advocate for the applicant has submitted a petition on 22.12.2020 wherein he has mentioned that the vehicle of the objector has no valid Fitness Certificate and also the objector has not paid the M.V.Tax since 31.03.2020.

276. ROUTE – MOHAMMAD FAIZUL RAHAMAN, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD04B6484.

Since, the applicant has not mentioned any route, this should not be considered.

277. ROUTE – NIRANJANA KHANDAI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR05AW0041.

Since, the applicant has not mentioned any route, this should not be considered.

278. ROUTE – JANMEJAYA NAYAK, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD10E-7351.

Since, the applicant has not mentioned any route, this should not be considered.

279. ROUTE – VIKASH GOPE, OWNE ROF VEHICLE OD14C-6594.

Since, the applicant has not mentioned any route, this should not be considered.

280. ROUTE – BHUBANESWAR TO DOVAKANDSORE VIA BHANJKIA, JASHIPUR, SUKRULI, GHATAGAON, ANANDAPUR AND BACK, LAXMIPRIYA CHATTAR, OWNER OF VEHICLE OR01Q3333.

Applicant is represented by her husband Sri Sagar Chandra Chattar. He stated that the applicant has applied to operate her service as alter service of OD15D-0795.


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

281. ROUTE – CHANDAHANDI TO KHARIAR VIA URMAL AND BACK, HRUDANANDA BISHI, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD26D4527.

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

282. ROUTE – BENIAPALI TO BARGARH VIA SARIA, BHUKTA, SAMARDHARA - 3 RT AND BACK, BIJAY KUMAR MAHAPATRA, OWNER OF VEHICLE OD13F6761.

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


 22.1.2021
**Transport Commissioner-Cum-
Chairman, STA, Odisha, Cuttack.**