



2026:CGHC:15351



2026:CGHC:15351

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****WPC No. 4493 of 2021**

1 - Sayyad Anwar Ali S/o Sayyad Ahmad Ali Aged About 53 Years C/o Royal Travels, Shop No. 03, Pagaria Complex , New Bus Stand , Pandri, Raipur , District Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

--- Petitioner(s)**versus**

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Transport , Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar , Naya Raipur , District Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

2 - Single Regional Transport Authority Third Floor, Commercial Complex Sector 27, Atal Nagar , Naya Raipur , District Raipur Chhattisgarh.

3 - Shrimati Varinder Kaur Bhatia Silky Travels Patthalgaon, District Jashpur Chhattisgarh.

4 - Shrimati Harvinder Kaur Bhatia Silky Travels Patthalgaon, District Jashpur Chhattisgarh.



5 - Shri Trilochan Singh Bhatia Silky Travels Patthalgaon, District Jashpur Chhattisgarh.

6 - Shri Vasan Singh New Bus Stand , Pandri, Raipur Chhattisgarh.

7 - Minntulla Rahmani New Shamim Transport , Ambikapur Chhattisgarh.

--- Respondent(s)

WPC No. 5390 of 2021

1 - Gopendra Singh Chouhan S/o Late Rameshwar Singh Chouhan Aged About 58 Years R/o Shanti Nagar Ward, Jagdalpur, District Bastar Chhattisgarh.

---Petitioner(s)

Versus

1 - Secretary Regional Transport Authority, Raipur Region, Chhattisgarh, 3rd Floor, Commercial Complex, Sector - 27, Naya Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.

2 - Regional Transport Authority Raipur, Chhattisgarh Third Floor, Commercial Complex, Sector - 27, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.

3 - State Transport Appellate Tribunal Ghadi Chowk, Raipur Chhattisgarh.

-- Respondent(s)

WPC No. 4927 of 2021

1 - Rampukar Singh S/o Late Dev Nandan Singh Aged About 60 Years R/o Kewdabadi, Raigarh, Chhattisgarh, District : Raigarh, Chhattisgarh



---Petitioner(s)

Versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Transport, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

2 - Single Regional Transport Authority Third Floor, Commercial Complex, Sector- 27, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

--- Respondent(s)

WPC No. 4932 of 2021

1 - Sanjay Mishra S/o Maharajdin Mishra Aged About 50 Years R/o Hikmi Para, Jagdalpur District Bastar Chhattisgarh.

---Petitioner(s)

Versus

1 - Secretary, Regional Transport Authority, Raipur Region, Chhattisgarh 3rd Floor, Commercial Complex, Sector-27, Naya Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh.

2 - Regional Transport Authority Raipur Chhattisgarh Third Floor, Commercial Complex, Sector-27, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh.

3 - State Transport Appellate Tribunal Ghadi Chowk, Raipur Chhattisgarh.

--- Respondent(s)



For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Amit Jaiswal, Advocate on behalf of Mr. Ajay Pal Singh, Advocate.
For Respondent(s)/State	:	Mr. D.R. Minj, Dy. A.G.
For Respondents No. 3 & 4 in WPC No. 4493/2021	:	Mr. Subodh Pandey, Advocate appeared through video conferencing.

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Amitendra Kishore Prasad

Order on Board

02/04/2026

1. Since common question of facts and law is involved in these cases, as such, all these petitions are being disposed of by this common order.
2. The petitioners have prayed for certain reliefs in the writ petitions. Though there are some sort of differences in respect of prayer made by the petitioners in all the petitions, however, in sum and substance, the reliefs are altogether similar and identical. The reliefs prayed in **WPC No. 4493/2021 (Sayyad Anwar Ali vs. State of Chhattisgarh & others)** are quoted hereinbelow in order to consider these cases and to decide the same.

"10.1 That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly pass appropriate writ, direction or order quashing the impugned order dated 04.07.2020 (Annexure P/1).

10.2 Any appropriate writ, direction or order may also kindly be passed in favour of the petitioner, which this Hon'ble Court deems fit in the circumstances of the



case.”

3. Brief facts of the case, is that, the petitioner, a bus operator, is engaged in plying buses on various intra-state and inter-state routes on the strength of permits duly granted by the competent transport authorities. In accordance with Section 88 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, any permit granted for inter-region or inter-state routes is ordinarily required to be countersigned by the authority of the concerned region or State. The petitioner is the registered owner of several buses operating under valid permits, including Stage Carriage Permit No. 696/BSP/2018 issued by the Regional Transport Authority, Bilaspur, for the route from Durg to Jashpur via Raipur, Saraipali, Raigarh, Pathalgaon, Kansabel, and Kunkuri, with one daily round trip. Since the said route traverses multiple regions, the petitioner applied for countersignature before the Regional Transport Authority, Raipur on 29.01.2020. However, during the pendency of the said application, the State Government, by notification dated 29.01.2019 issued under Section 68 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, abolished all Regional Transport Authorities and constituted a Single Regional Authority for the entire State of Chhattisgarh. Consequently, as the entire State became a single region for the purposes of Section 68, the requirement of countersignature for inter-regional permits ceased to exist. Notwithstanding this legal position, Respondent No. 2, i.e., the Single Regional Authority, erroneously rejected the petitioner's pending application for



countersignature, which had earlier been submitted before the different Regional Transport Authorities, by order dated 04.07.2020.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the impugned order passed by the respondent is wholly without jurisdiction and authority of law. It is contended that, pursuant to the Gazette Notification dated 27.12.2019, the entire State has been declared as a Single Regional Transport Authority, and therefore, no countersignature is required for a stage carriage permit. It is further submitted that the petitioner neither applied for any countersignature before respondent No. 2, nor was any such application invited; rather, the respondent, on its own accord, called for pending applications from different Regional Authorities and decided the same arbitrarily. The counsel argues that there exists no provision under the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 empowering the respondent to invite objections from existing route operators and to refuse countersignature on that basis, rendering the action wholly illegal and without jurisdiction. It is also contended that no opportunity of hearing was afforded to the petitioner before refusal, in clear violation of the statutory provisions and the principles of natural justice. Lastly, it is submitted that such arbitrary and unjust action on the part of the respondents has infringed the fundamental rights of the petitioner, who has been made to suffer due to the respondents' own delay and default, particularly during the pandemic period.



5. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State, as well as respondents No. 3 and 4, vehemently opposed the submissions advanced by the petitioner and resisted the grant of any relief, contending that the impugned action is in accordance with law and does not warrant any interference by this Hon'ble Court.
6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.
7. Upon a careful perusal of the reliefs sought by the petitioner, as well as the impugned order dated 04.07.2020, it appears that the present dispute pertains to the allocation of a timing slot for operating a bus from Bilaspur on the route extending from Durg to Jashpur via Raipur, Saraipali, Raigarh, Pathalgaon, Kansabel, and Kunkuri. It is evident that the petitioner has assailed the said order which was passed on 4.7.2020 as more than five years have elapsed since its issuance after a considerable lapse of time, nothing survives for adjudication in the matters.
8. In view of such inordinate delay, and without delving into or adjudicating upon the merits of the case, this Court deems it appropriate to **dispose of** the present writ petitions with liberty granted to the petitioners to institute a fresh petitions, if so required, in the event any exigency arises in the future.

Sd/-
(Amitendra Kishore Prasad)
Judge