



2026:CGHC:9874



2026:CGHC:9874

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****WPC No. 843 of 2026**

M/s Chhabra Bus Service Through Its Partner Mahendra Singh Chhabra, Aged About 50 Years, S/o Santosh Singh Chhabra, R/o Ring Road, Namnakala, Amabikapur, Distt - Sarguja, Chhattisgarh.

... Petitioner**versus**

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Transport, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

2 - State Transport Authority Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

3 - Rakesh Gupta S/o Ramchandra Gupta Aged About 42 Years R/o Old Post Office, Darripura, Ambikapur, Distt - Sarguja, Chhattisgarh.

... Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Bharat Lal Dembra, Advocate
For Respondents 1 & 2/State	:	Mr. Vinay Pandey, Dy. Advocate General
For Respondent No.3	:	Mr. Anshul R Shrivastava, Advocate

(Hon'ble Shri Justice Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi)**Order on Board****25.02.2026**

1. The petitioner has preferred this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, challenging Order dated 28.01.2026 (Annexure-P/1) passed by State Transport Appellate Tribunal (STAT), Raipur in Revision Case No.56/2025, whereby, revision filed by the petitioner has been dismissed holding it to be premature.



2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that vide impugned order, the STAT, Raipur has dismissed the revision only on the ground that since the subject interstate permanent stage carriage permit issued by the State Transport Authority, Raipur, vide Order dated 18.6.2025 (Annexure-P/2), has not been countersigned by the State Transport Authority of State of Jharkhand, therefore, revision filed by the petitioner/revisionist, challenging the order dated 18.6.2025, is completely illegal as vide aforesaid order, the State Transport Authority has issued permit of its part, which has been issued in contravention of reciprocal agreement between the State of Chhattisgarh and the State of Jharkhand, but this issue has not been considered by the STAT, hence, it is prayed that impugned order may be quashed and the matter may be remitted back to the STAT to reconsider the revision filed by the petitioner/revisionist.

3. Learned counsel for respondents No1 & 2/State as well as respondent No.3 have raised their objection to the contention raised by learned counsel for the petitioner.

4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

5. Perusal of the impugned Order dated 28.01.2026 (Annexure-P/1) shows that the revision was filed by the petitioner before the STAT raising various grounds, but that revision petition has been dismissed by the STAT only on the ground that since inter state permit issued by the State Transport Authority, Raipur (CG) has not been countersigned by the State Transport Authority of State of Jharkhand, therefore, the revision is premature. But since the State Transport Authority, Raipur has already passed order in favour of respondent No.3/Rakesh Gupta, issuing interstate transport permit in his favour, therefore, if the petitioner files an application raising various



objections against that order, then STAT ought to have considered the grounds of the revision as to whether in light of those objection, order dated 18.6.2025 issuing interstate permanent stage carriage permit in favour of respondent No.3, is in accordance with law or not. Though that permit has not been countersigned by the State Transport authority of State of Jharkhand, but it has attained finality so far as it relates to the State Transport Authority of State of Chhattisgarh, therefore, it cannot be said that revision filed by the petitioner challenging the order dated 18.6.2025 was premature. Therefore, impugned order is not found to be sustainable and the same is deserves to be set aside.

6. Accordingly, the petition is allowed, impugned order dated 28.01.2026 passed by STAT is set aside and the case is remitted back to the State Transport Appellate Tribunal to reconsider the Revision Case No.56/2025 and to pass order afresh, after providing due opportunity of hearing to the parties, within 30 days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

7. Pending interlocutory application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi)
Judge