



2026:CGHC:9442



2026:CGHC:9442

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 797 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, Ambikapur, Distt. Sarguja C.G.

... Petitioner.

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Transport, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur C.G.
2. State Transport Authority, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur C.G.
3. Rakesh Gupta S/o Ramchandra Gupta Aged About 42 Years R/o Old Post Office, Darripura, Ambikapur, Distt Sarguja C.G.

... Respondents.

(cause title downloaded from CIS Periphery)

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Bharat Lal Dembra, Advocate.
For Res No.1 & 2	:	Mr. Pranjal Shukla, PL.
For Res No.3	:	Mr. Anshul R. Shrivastava, Advocate through caveat.

(Hon'ble Shri Justice Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi)

Order on Board

24 /02/2026

Heard.

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner, respondent No.3, and 4 other persons (all of whom are bus owners) filed an application



before the learned State Transport Authority, Raipur (respondent No. 2) for the grant of an interstate permanent carriage permit on the Vishrampur to Garhwa Road route. This application was rejected by respondent No.2 on 18.06.2025 (Annexure-P/2) solely on the grounds that the bus proposed by respondent No. 3 is a "Deluxe AC Bus," whereas the buses proposed by the petitioner and other owners are of the "General Class."

2. He further submits that being dissatisfied with the order dated 18.06.2025, the petitioner challenged the same before the learned State Transport Appellate Tribunal, Raipur, by filing Appeal No.26/2025 (*Chhabda Bus Service Vs. State Transport Authority and Anr.*). However, by the impugned order dated 28.01.2026 (Annexure-P/1), the Appellate Tribunal dismissed the appeal, observing that a countersignature had not been made by the State of Jharkhand in favour of respondent No. 3 to operate the bus. He contended that in the impugned order neither proper reason was assigned for dismissing the petitioner's appeal, nor the findings given by the State Transport Authority (respondent No.2) in rejecting the application was considered. Therefore, he submits that the impugned order was passed in a mechanical manner and prayed that the matter be remitted back to the Appellate Tribunal to reconsider the petitioner's appeal in accordance with the law.
3. Per contra, learned counsel for the State and respondent No.3 support the impugned order.
4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.
5. A bare perusal of the order dated 18.06.2025 (Annexure-P/2) passed by the learned State Transport Authority, Raipur (respondent No. 2), shows that the



application filed by the petitioner was rejected on the ground that the bus proposed by the petitioner is of the "General Class," whereas the bus proposed by respondent No. 3 is a "Deluxe AC Bus." The Authority further observed that the bus of respondent No.3 belongs to a higher class, which would be more beneficial for passengers and provide better revenue to the State Government. However, the reasoning provided by the learned State Transport Authority was not considered by the learned State Transport Appellate Tribunal. Instead, the impugned order dated 28.01.2026 (Annexure-P/1) was passed on an entirely different footing and in a mechanical manner. Consequently, this Court is of the view that the impugned order dated 28.01.2026 (Annexure-P/1) is unsustainable and the same deserves to be, and is hereby, quashed.

6. The prayer made by the petitioner is allowed. The matter is remitted back to the State Transport Appellate Tribunal to reconsider the appeal preferred by the petitioner and to pass a fresh speaking order, specifically discussing the observations made by the State Transport Authority in its order dated 18.06.2025 (Annexure-P/2).
7. The Appellate Tribunal shall pass a fresh speaking order within a period of 30 days from the date of receipt/communication of this order, in accordance with the law.
8. With the aforesaid observations and directions, this petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi)
Judge

Ajay