(2014) 07 AP CK 0008

Andhra Pradesh High Court

Case No: Public Interest Litigation No. 168 of 2014

Telangana Yuva Shakti — APPELLANT

Vs

The Government of India — RESPONDENT

Date of Decision: July 14, 2014

Acts Referred:

- Constitution of India, 1950 - Article 14
- Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 - Section 41(6)

Citation: (2015) 1 ACC 562 : AIR 2014 AP 47 : (2014) 5 ALT 217 : (2014) 2 AnWR 852

Hon'ble Judges: Kalyan Jyoti Sengupta, C.J; Sanjay Kumar, J

Bench: Division Bench

Advocate: S.S. Varma and Government Pleader, Advocate for the Respondent

Final Decision: Dismissed

Judgement

@JUDGMENTTAG-ORDER

Kalyan Jyoti Sengupta, C.J.
The petitioner - political party is represented by its President, who appears in person. In terms of our earlier order, he has produced relevant document to show that he is the office bearer of petitioner and the said document is taken on record.

2. This writ petition has been filed to challenge State name in numerical as TS instead of TG for registration of the motor vehicles after separation of former State of Andhra Pradesh and formation of the Government of Telangana, under the provisions of the Andhra Pradesh Reorganisation Act, 2014 (hereinafter referred to as Act 2014). The aforesaid symbol is intended to be used on the motor vehicles, which are required to be registered by Transport Department of the State of Telangana.

3. It is the contention of the petitioner that by notification dated 9th June, 2014 it was made public that two letters TG which are natural abbreviation to denote

Telangana State would be used. Subsequently on 12th June, 2014 by a notification dated 12th June, 2014 first respondent revised its own decision to that TG is to be replaced with TS as abbreviated name of the State. According to the petitioner, this amendment is illogical, unnatural and also confusing, particularly this abbreviation will not be universally acceptable. In the Act 2014 the name of the State of Telangana is mentioned as Telangana State. No reason has been disclosed to effect such change.

4. Learned Government Pleader for Transport appearing for the State of Telangana, on the other hand, contends that the aforesaid symbol TS has been issued by the impugned notification in exercise of power u/s 41(6) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (for short, Act 1988) read with the notification of the Government of India. In exercise of powers conferred under the aforesaid Act 1988, the Central Government on 9.6.2014 has issued a notification. In the said Notification dt.9.6.2014 it is clearly mentioned that in the serial No. 29A relating to the State of Telangana, the entry TG shall be substituted with TS. The aforesaid notification issued by the Central Government is sought to be implemented. However, he contends that this change of TG to TS is not illogical or irrational within the concept of Article 14 of the Constitution of India, since the letters TS denote Telangana State. Therefore, any symbol which is sought to be adopted by the Government, if not irrational, cannot be scrutinized by this Court that it is wholly irrational.

5. We have heard the petitioner in person and the learned Government Pleader for Transport.

6. It appears, the power of the Central Government to issue the notification is not challenged specifically. The challenge is to the change of symbol from TG to TS on the ground of irrationality and absurdity. So issue is whether above group of letters TS to signify the State of Telangana is irrational, absurd on anvil of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

7. As rightly contended by the learned Government Pleader for Transport, the symbol TS is allocated as per the provisions of Section 41(6) of the Act 1988 that confer power upon Central Government to issue notification and we are of the view that the letters TS can also denote Telangana State. According to us it is reasonably acceptable, and any person of reasonable prudence will understand what we do. Therefore, the challenge on the ground of irrationality and unreasonableness cannot be accepted.

8. Hence, we dismiss the writ petition. There will be no order as to costs.

Consequently, pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall also stand dismissed.