

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Thursday, the 18th day of September 2025 / 27th Bhadra, 1947

IA.NO.2/2025 IN WP(C) NO. 13238 OF 2022

APPLICANT/ADDL 8TH RESPONDEDNT SOUGHT TO BE IM-PLEADED:

M/S MY METRO BUS SERVICE LLP,CC 46/1927, A1, KANNATH ROAD,
CHAKKARAPARAMBU,THAMMANAM P.O.,PINCODE-682032, REPRESENTED BY ITS
PRESIDENT E.K.ABDUL KHADAR, S/O KOCHUNNI, RESIDING AT ERAPPAKOTTIL
HOUSE, PERINGALA P.O., ERNAKULAM DISTRICT, (SOUGHT TO BE IMPLEADED
)

RESPONDENTS/PETITIONERS & RESPONDENTS IN THE WRIT PETITION:

1. ABOOBACKER K.A., AGED 55 YEARS,KAROTHUKUDI, MUDICKAL P.O.,
PERUMBAVOOR, MOLUDUPURA, ERNAKULAM-683 547.
2. ASAD.E.M., ELAVUMKUDY HOUSE, MARAMPILLY P.O., PERUMBAVOOR,
ERNAKULAM, PIN-683 105.
3. RAJESH.P.R., PEEDIKAKKUDIYIL, KEEZHILLAM P.O., PERUMBAVOOR,
ERNAKULAM, PIN-683 541.
4. VARGHESE P.A. @ ANTONY VARGHESE, POTHEN HOUSE, OKKAL P.O.,
PERUMBAVOOR, ERNAKULAM-683 550.
5. SIDHIKK, THEKEVADAYATH, PONASSERY P.O., PERUMBAVOOR, ERNAKULAM-683
547.
6. NAJEEB.V.S., VELLAKUDI, ALLAPFA P.O., PERUMBAVOOR, ERNAKULAM-683
536.
7. GINU @ THOMAS, MELETHADAM, PEERUMBAVOOR P.O., PERUMBAVOOR,
ERNAKULAM-683 542.
8. RAHEEM, KIDANGASSERY HOUSE, VAZHAKKULAM P.O., PERUMBAVOOR,
ERNAKULAM-683 105.
9. SHAMEER ROSHAN, KALLINGAL HOUSE, MUDICKAL P.O., PERUMBAVOOR,
ERNAKULAM-683 547.
10. MANAF.T.S., THURUTHUMMEL HOUSE, PERUMBAVOOR P.O., PARAPPURAM,
ERNAKULAM-683 547.
11. ABDUL KAREEM.P.S., PUTHENVEETIL HOUSE, MUDICKAL P.O., PERUMBAVOOR,
ERNAKULAM-683 547.
12. MAHINKUTTY, VATTATHARA HOUSE, MARAMPILLY P.O., PERUMBAVOOR,
ERNAKULAM, PIN-683 105.
13. K.M.UMMER, KOTTAPURATH HOUSE, SREEMOOLANAGARAM P.O., ALUVA,
ERNAKULAM-683 105.
14. NAJEEB.M.A., PANDIYAMOODU HOUSE, PERUMBAVOOR P.O., PERUMBAVOOR,
ERNAKULAM-683 542.
15. NASEEMA.K.A.,ALANGAYI HOUSE, ALLAPRA P.O., PERUMBAVOOR,
ERNAKULAM-683 556.
16. DILSHAD ABDUL MAJEED, CHEELAKKATTUPARAMBIL HOUSE, PONJASSERY P.O.,
PERUMBAVOOR, ERNAKULAM-683 547.
17. LATHEEF, CHERUVALLIKUDY HOUSE, RAYONPURAM P.O., PERUMBAVOOR,
ERNAKULAM, PIN-683 543.
18. SUBAIR.M.A., MUNDACKAL HOUSE, MUDICKAL P.O., PERUMBAVOOR,

ERNAKULAM-683 547.

19. JOINT REGIONAL TRANSPORT OFFICER, OFFICE OF THE JOINT REGIONAL TRANSPORT OFFICER, IRONGOLE P.O., PERUMBAVOOR, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT, PIN-683 548.
20. STATION HOUSE OFFICER, PERUMBAVOOR POLICE STATION, PERUMBAVOOR-683 542.
21. THE DISTRICT MAGISTRATE ERNAKULAM
22. THE REGIONAL TRANSPORT OFFICER, ERNAKULAM
23. THE CITY POLICE COMMISSIONER, KOCHI. ADDL. R3 TO R5 ARE IMPEADED AS PER ORDER DATED 17.06.2022 IN WPC NO. 13238/2022.
24. THE ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEER, KERALA STATE POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD, DISTRICT COURT - I, GANDHI NAGAR - 682020 IS SUO MOTO IMPEADED AS PER ORDER DATED 17.11.2022 IN WPC NO. 13238/2022.
25. CSML (COCHIN SMART MISSION LIMITED) KALOOR, KOCHI. REPRESENTED BY CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER.*ADDITIONAL R7 IS SUO MOTO IMPEADED AS PER ORDER DATED 03.07.2023 IN WP(C) 13238/2022

Application praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed therewith the High Court be pleased to implead the applicants herein as additional 8th respondent in the above writ petition(civil).

This Application coming on for orders upon perusing the application and the affidavit filed in support thereof, and upon hearing the arguments of M/S.SAJEEV KUMAR K.GOPAL, Advocates for the petitioners and M/S.P.M.SANEER & P.A.SHAJI SAMAD, Advocate for R1 to R18 and M/S..E.K.NANDAKUMAR, AMICUS CURIAE & JAI MOHAN Advocate for R19 and SRI. T.NAVEEN SC, Advocate for R24 and SMT.M.U.VIJAYALAKSHMI, SC & K.JAJU BABU (SR.) Advocates for R25, the court passed the following:

AMIT RAWAL , J.

WP(C)No.13238 of 2022

Dated this the 18th day of September, 2025

ORDER

I.A.No.2 of 2025

This application has been filed on behalf of *My Metro Bus Services LLP*, comprising twenty stage carriage operators operating on the Vyttila–Vyttila Circular city route, represented through Shri. E.K. Abdul Khadar, seeking impleadment as respondent No. 8 in the aforementioned writ petition in the capacity of a stage carriage permit holder

2. Issue notice of this application to Amicus Curiae as well as Sri.Santhoshkumar, learned counsel for the State.

3. There is no objection for impleadment. Application for impleadment is allowed. Registry to carry out impleadment.

WP(C)No.13238 of 2022

4. Sri. Sajeev Kumar K. Gopal, representing the aforementioned twenty stage carriage permit holders, has submitted a suggestion regarding the revision of the

timetables for different routes. Sri. Santhosh Kumar seeks time to examine the same and place it before the Committee, which had already convened on 10.09.2025, in terms of the affidavit dated 08.09.2025, regarding the revision of stage carriage timings, prescribing a five-minute gap within city limits and a ten-minute gap within Panchayat limits.

5. Conclusion of the aforementioned meeting noticed the complexity of the issues with various stakeholders proposing different solutions, from a simple timetable change for new permits to full-scale AI-driven system and route re-planning. While there was a consensus that the current situation is problematic, there was no single, agreed upon path forward. Therefore, the RTA is required to consider the feasibility and implications of each proposal and in this regard further discussion and data analysis is required to be formulated and therefore the decision of the RTA is awaited.

6. This Court appreciates the compliance of the

judgment of this Court and also notes that a few stage carriage holders, who were additionally impleaded as respondent No. 8, have suggested a change in the time schedule, as the existing timetable between the two routes is too short, resulting in fast driving of stage carriages, which in turn is causing accidents and other serious hazards to pedestrians.

7. Adv.Nazrin Bhanu appearing for the Kleen Smart Bus Limited (KSBL) i.e., one of the instrumentality of metro corporation had submitted a revamping of the stage carriage timing system on AI based dynamic bus scheduling system before the RTA in the meeting held on 10.09.2025 giving certain suggestions that it is a need of the hour where the extensive study is required to change the time schedule not based upon the fixed routes but dynamic time schedule, keeping in view the traffic congestion on the basis of the data to be collected through AI so that the road blockages can be prevented. This Court thus direct the RTA to take into consideration all these factors i.e., the suggestion given

by the city carriage permit holders as well as KSBL, suggestions of Amicus Curiae and the suggestions of the official bus operators for the purpose of coming out an effective time schedule for smooth running of transport buses in the city as early as possible but not later than three months from today.

I.A.No.1 of 2025

8. This application has been filed accompanied by an affidavit of the Assistant Commissioner of Police Traffic Enforcement Unit (West) and on behalf of the 5th respondent for modification of the interim order dated 27.08.2025. The main thrust of modification is contained in paragraph No.11 of the interim order. The same reads as under:

11. Mr.Jai Mohan amicus curiae informs the Court that on two roads from Banerji Road till Palarivattom, and from Medical Trust Hospital till Vyttila, there are many traffic lights which have a very less timing and very few vehicles move ahead when the green light is signalled and immediately there is again a red light. At peak hours like in the morning between 8.30 to 10.00 and evening between 5 to 7.30, all the traffic lights should be put off and the traffic should be controlled manually by installing the traffic police

personal with walkie-talkies so that were able to communicate each other with regard to the congestion of the traffic on the road. These directions are issued forthwith to the City Police Commissioner for immediate compliance, particularly considering the fact that there is already an increased rush of traffic on account of the Onam holidays.”

9. The contents of paragraph No. 11 extracted above would reveal that, in the absence of a traffic island, it is very arduous and difficult for the traffic officer to manage traffic manually by switching off the traffic lights, owing to factors such as the inability to monitor the long and impending queues of vehicles on either side of the road, including the crossroad. In order to provide relief to the prevailing traffic congestion, a hybrid mode has been introduced, namely, manually switching off the traffic signals during peak hours. The aforementioned request in my considered view is fair and justified, much less, viable. Accordingly, I modify the interim order dated 27.08.2025 and direct that the traffic police personnel deputed at the major traffic signal junctions, from Banerji Road to Palarivattom and from

Pallimukku Junction to Vyttila, shall operate the traffic signal lights manually during peak hours, which, in my considered view, would enable them to control and regulate the heavy flow of vehicles during the said period.

This writ petition be placed before the Hon'ble Chief Justice for appropriate allocation.

Sd/-

AMIT RAWAL, JUDGE

nak

