



“C.R.”

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE D. K. SINGH

FRIDAY, THE 29<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF NOVEMBER 2024 / 8TH AGRAHAYANA, 1946

WP(C) NO. 10761 OF 2022

PETITIONER/S:

MOTORSIGNS INDIA,  
810 ANNA SALAI, NANDANAM, CHENNAI 600035, TAMIL NADU, INDIA REPRESENTED  
BY ITS SOLE PROPRIETOR, THOMAS CHERIAN

BY ADVS. K.RAMAKUMAR (SR.)  
S.M.PRASANTH  
G.RENJITH  
ASWINI SANKAR R.S.  
T.H.ARAVIND  
T.RAMPRASAD UNNI

RESPONDENT/S:

- 1 STATE OF KERALA,  
REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR  
VEHICLES, GOVERNMENT OF KERALA, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM 695001.
- 2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,  
DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES, GOVERNMENT OF KERLA,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM 695001.
- 3 THE TRANSPORT COMMISSIONER,



TRANSPORT COMMISSIONERATE, TRANS TOWER- 2ND FLOOR, VAZHUTHACAUD, P.O. THYCAUD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA , 695014.

- 4 ADDL.R4 ACCIDENT RESCUE 24X7,  
PANAPUZHA, KAKKAD P.O., TIRURANGADI, MALAPPURAM - 676306, REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, SHRI.JAMSHEER KOORIYADAN [ADDL.R4 IS IMPEADED AS PER ORDER DATED 04/07/2023 IN I.A-1/2022 IN WP(C) 10761/2022].
- 5 ADDL.R5 ALL INDIA MOTOR VEHICLE SECURITY ASSOCIATION,  
45, 1ST FLOOR, COMMUNITY CENTRE, NARAINA PHASE-1, NEW DELHI-110028, REPRESENTED BY ITS AUTHORIZED SIGNATORY SHRI. T.SUJITH MUGESH, [ADDL.R5 IS IMPEADED AS PER ORDER DATED 04.07.2023 IN I.A-3/2023 IN WP(C) 10761/2022].
- 6 ADDL.R6 ASSOCIATION OF REGISTRATION PLATES MANUFACTURERS OF INDIA (REGD.) F-119, MAYAPURI INDUSTRIAL AREA, PHASE &#8211; II, NEW DELHI &#8211; 110064, REPRESENTED BY ITS PRESIDENT MR. MAHESH MALHOTRA [ADDL.R6 IS IMPEADED AS PER ORDER DATED 04.07.2023 IN I.A-5/2023 IN WP(C) 10761/2022]
- 7 UNION OF INDIA,  
REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY TO MINISTRY OF ROADS, TRANSPORTS AND HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT BHAWAN, 1, PARLIAMENT STREET, NEW DELHI - 110 001 ( SOUGHT TO BE IMPEADED ).
- 8 THE AUTOMOTIVE RESEARCH ASSOCIATION OF INDIA (ARAI) ,  
REPRESENTED BY ITS DIRECTOR, SURVEY NO. 2, VETAL HILL, OPP: PAUD ROAD, KOTHRUD, PUNE &#8211; 411038. ( SOUGHT TO BE IMPEADED ).
- 9 THE INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY (ICAT) ,  
REPRESENTED BY ITS DIRECTOR, PLOT 26, SECTOR 3, IMT MANESAR, GURUGRAM, HARYANA &#8211; 122050. ( SOUGHT TO BE IMPEADED ).
- 10 THE CENTRAL ROAD RESEARCH INSTITUTE (CRRI),  
REPRESENTED BY ITS DIRECTOR, DELHI &#8211; MATHURA ROAD, P.O. CRRI, NEW DELHI &#8211; 110 020. ( SOUGHT TO BE IMPEADED ).
- 11 THE VEHICLES RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT ESTABLISHMENT (VRDE),  
REPRESENTED BY ITS DIRECTOR, P.O. VAHAN NAGAR, AHMEDNAGAR, MAHARASHTRA - 414006. ( SOUGHT TO BE IMPEADED ).
- 12 THE CENTRAL INSTITUTE OF ROAD TRANSPORT (CIRT) ,  
REPRESENTED BY ITS DIRECTOR, PUNE &#8211; NASIK ROAD, PUNE &#8211; 411026. (



SOUGHT TO BE IMPEADED )

- 13 THE GLOBAL AUTOMOTIVE RESEARCH CENTRE (GARC) ,  
PLOT E1, SIPCOT INDUSTRIAL GROWTH CENTRE, ORAGADAM, MATHUR P.O.,  
SRIPERUMBUDUR TALUK, TIRUVALLUR DISTRICT, TAMIL NADU &#8211; 602 105  
REPRESENTED BY ITS DIRECTOR. ( SOUGHT TO BE IMPEADED )

BY ADVS. P.A.MOHAMMED SHAH, HARIKUMAR G. (GOPINATHAN NAIR)  
MILLU DANDAPANI, VISHNU J., CGC, N.N.GIRIJA, V.S.ABHISHEK  
RENOY VINCENT, HELEN P.A., ARUN ROY, SHAHIR SHOWKATH ALI  
ALEESHA SHEREEF, SRI.P. SANTHOSH KUMAR -SPL.GP

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING FINALLY HEARD ON 29.11.2024, ALONG WITH  
WP(C).7089/2023, 18049/2023 AND CONNECTED CASES, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE  
FOLLOWING:



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE D. K. SINGH

FRIDAY, THE 29<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF NOVEMBER 2024 / 8TH AGRAHAYANA, 1946

WP(C) NO. 7089 OF 2023

PETITIONER/S:

ORBIZ AUTOMOTIVEZ, PLOT NO. 23/A AND 23/C, INKEL CITY, PANAKKAD VILLAGE,  
MALAPPURAM-676519; REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING PARTNER, SHRI. JABIR M

BY ADVS. P.A.MOHAMMED SHAH, SHAHIR SHOWKATH ALI  
HELEN P.A., ARUN ROY

RESPONDENT/S:

- 1 STATE OF KERALA,  
REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY, TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695001.
- 2 TRANSPORT COMMISSIONER,  
2ND FLOOR, TRANS TOWERS, VAZHUTHACAUD, THYCAUD P.O.,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.-695014.
- 3 ADDL.R3: UNION OF INDIA,  
REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY, MINISTRY OF ROAD TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS, NEW  
DELHI- 110 001(IS IMPEADED AS PER ORDER DATED 21/03/2023 IN IA 1/23 IN WP(C))
- 4 ADDL.R4: ASSOCIATION OF REGISTRATION PLATES MANUFACTURERS OF INDIA  
(REGD.), F-119, MAYAPURI INDUSTRIAL AREA, PHASE &#8211; II, NEW DELHI &#8211;  
110 064, REPRESENTED BY ITS PRESIDENT MR. MAHESH MALHOTRA. (IS IMPEADED  
AS PER ORDER DATED 04/07/2023 IN IA 2/23 IN WP(C)).



- 5 ADDL.R5: BND ENERGY PVT. LTD.,  
HAVING ITS REGISTERED OFFICE AT 23-24 BHURAKHIA ARCADE, 2ND FLOOR, NEAR  
NAVJIVAN RESTAURANT, SURAT KAMREJ ROAD, SURAT, GUJARAT - 395 006L;  
REPRESENTED BY ITS DIRECTOR SHRI. DESAI DHARMESHKUMAR LALJIBHAI. ( IS  
IMPLEADED AS PER ORDER DATED 04/07/2023 IN IA 4/23 IN WP(C) )
  
- 6 TEDI (INDIA) PRIVATE LIMITED,  
PLOT NO. C54, SIDCO INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, MARAIMALAI NAGAR, CHENGALPATTU  
DISTRICT, TAMIL NADU. ( SOUGHT TO BE IMPLEADED ).

BY ADVS. SRI P SANTHOSH KUMAR (SPL GP), SRI T C KRISHNA DSGI,  
MILLU DANDAPANI, CHELSON CHEMBARATHY, MUHAMED JUNAID V.

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING FINALLY HEARD ON 29.11.2024, ALONG WITH  
WP(C).10761/2022 AND CONNECTED CASES, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE D. K. SINGH

FRIDAY, THE 29<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF NOVEMBER 2024 / 8TH AGRAHAYANA, 1946

WP(C) NO. 18049 OF 2023

PETITIONER/S:

BND ENERGY PVT. LTD,  
23-24 BHURAKHIA ARCADE, 2ND FLOOR, NEAR NAVJIVAN RESTAURANT, SURAT  
KAMREJ ROAD, SURAT, GUJARAT &#8211; 395006; REPRESENTED BY ITS DIRECTOR  
SHRI. DESAI DHARMESHKUMAR LALJIBHAI

BY ADVS. P.A.MOHAMMED SHAH, RENOY VINCENT, SHAHIR SHOWKATH ALI  
CHELSON CHEMBARATHY, MUHAMED JUNAID V., SHILU SEBASTIAN

RESPONDENT/S:

- 1 UNION OF INDIA, REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY, MINISTRY OF ROAD TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS, NEW DELHI, PIN - 110001
- 2 STATE OF KERALA,  
REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY, TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695001
- 3 TRANSPORT COMMISSIONER,  
2ND FLOOR, TRANS TOWERS, VAZHUTHACAUD, THYCAUD P.O.,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695014
- 4 ASSOCIATION OF REGISTRATION PLATES MANUFACTURERS OF INDIA,  
F-119, MAYAPURI INDUSTRIAL AREA PHASE -11NEW DELHI-110064 REPRESENTED BY  
ITS PRESIDENT MAHESH MALHOTRA ( SOUGHT TO BE IMPLEADED ).

WP(C) NOS. 10761 OF 2022, 7089 OF 2023, 18049 OF 2023,  
22207 OF 2023, 29866 OF 2023, 14467 OF 2024



7

2024:KER:90019

BY ADVS. SRI P SANTHOSH KUMAR (SPL GP), SRI T C KRISHNA DSGI,  
SHRI.P.R.AJITH KUMAR, CGC, MILLU DANDAPANI

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING FINALLY HEARD ON 29.11.2024, ALONG WITH  
WP(C).10761/2022 AND CONNECTED CASES, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE D. K. SINGH

FRIDAY, THE 29<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF NOVEMBER 2024 / 8TH AGRAHAYANA, 1946

WP(C) NO. 22207 OF 2023

PETITIONER/S:

M/S. TEDI (INDIA) PRIVATE LIMITED,  
AGED 37 YEARS  
PLOT NO. C54, SIDCO INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, MARAIMALAI NAGAR, CHENGALPATTU  
DISTRICT, TAMIL NADU - 603209; REPRESENTED BY ITS DIRECTOR SHRI.ELUMALAI  
JAYARAMAN.

BY ADVS. P.A.MOHAMMED SHAH, RENOY VINCENT  
SHAHIR SHOWKATH ALI, CHELSON CHEMBARATHY  
SHILU SEBASTIAN, ADITH KRISHNAN.U., FATHIMA AFEEDA P.

RESPONDENT/S:

- 1 UNION OF INDIA,  
REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY, MINISTRY OF ROAD TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS, NEW  
DELHI, PIN - 110001
- 2 STATE OF KERALA,  
REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY, TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM &#8211; 695001.
- 3 TRANSPORT COMMISSIONER,  
2ND FLOOR, TRANS TOWERS, VAZHUTHACAUD, THYCAUD P.O.,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695014
- 4 ALL INDIA MOTOR VEHICLE SECURITY ASSOCIATION,





45,1ST FLOOR, COMMUNITY CENTRE, NARAINA PHASE-I, NEW DELHI, REPRESENTED  
BY ITS AUTHORIZED SIGNATORY SHRI. T. SUJITH MUGESH ( R4 IMPEADED AS PER  
ORDER IN IA 1/23 DATED 5.9.23 ).

BY ADVS. SRI P SANTHOSH KUMAR (SPL GP), SRI VISHNU J CGC,  
K.V.SREE VINAYAKAN, HARIKUMAR G. (GOPINATHAN NAIR)

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING FINALLY HEARD ON 29.11.2024, ALONG WITH  
WP(C).10761/2022 AND CONNECTED CASES, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE D. K. SINGH

FRIDAY, THE 29<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF NOVEMBER 2024 / 8TH AGRAHAYANA, 1946

WP(C) NO. 29866 OF 2023

PETITIONER/S:

HIGH SECURITY REGISTRATION PLATE (HSRP) MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION OF INDIA, BUILDING NO. 66/1619, ABIDAS ARCADE, PIYOLI ROAD, ERNAKULAM, REPRESENTED BY ITS PRESIDENT, SHRI.M. JAHFAR, PIN - 682018

BY ADVS. DR ADITHYA SONDHI (SR) P.A. MOHAMMED SHAH, RENOY VINCENT, SHAHIR SHOWKATH ALI, CHELSON CHEMBARATHY, ABEE SHEJIRIK FASLA N.K, MUHAMED JUNAID V., ADITH KRISHNAN.U., FATHIMA AFEEDA P.

RESPONDENT/S:

- 1 UNION OF INDIA, REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY, MINISTRY OF ROAD TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS, NEW DELHI, PIN - 110001
- 2 STATE OF KERALA,  
REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY, TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695001
- 3 TRANSPORT COMMISSIONER,  
2ND FLOOR, TRANS TOWERS, VAZHUTHACAUD, THYCAUD P.O.,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695014
- 4 ASSOCIATION OF REGISTRATION PLATES MANUFACTURERS OF INDIA (REGD) ,  
F-119 , MAYAPURI INDUSTRIAL AREA PHASE -11 NEW DELHI ( SOUGHT TO BE  
IMPLEADED ).

WP(C) NOS. 10761 OF 2022, 7089 OF 2023, 18049 OF 2023,  
22207 OF 2023, 29866 OF 2023, 14467 OF 2024



11

2024:KER:90019

BY ADVS. SRI P SANTHOSH KUMAR (SPL GP), SRI T C KRISHNA DSGI,  
SHRI.MILLU DANDAPANI

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING FINALLY HEARD ON 29.11.2024, ALONG WITH  
WP(C).10761/2022 AND CONNECTED CASES, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE D. K. SINGH

FRIDAY, THE 29<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF NOVEMBER 2024 / 8TH AGRAHAYANA, 1946

WP(C) NO. 14467 OF 2024

PETITIONER/S:

ORBIZ AUTOMOTIVEZ,  
PLOT NO. 23/A AND 23/C, INKEL CITY, PANAKKAD VILLAGE, MALAPPURAM,  
REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING PARTNER, SHRI. JABIR M, PIN - 676519

BY ADVS. SRI NAVEEN R NATH (SR), SRI CHELSON CHEMBARATHY  
P.A.MOHAMMED SHAH, RENOY VINCENT, SHAHIR SHOWKATH ALI  
CHELSON CHEMBARATHY, ABEE SHEJIRIK FASLA N.K  
MUHAMED JUNAID V., FATHIMA AFEEDA P.  
ADITH KRISHNAN.U., SHERIN SHERIYAR

RESPONDENT/S:

- 1 UNION OF INDIA, REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY MINISTRY OF ROAD TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS, NEW DELHI, PIN - 110001
- 2 STATE OF KERALA,  
REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY, TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695001
- 3 TRANSPORT COMMISSIONER,  
2ND FLOOR, TRANS TOWERS, VAZHUTHACAUD, THYCAUD P.O.,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695014
- 4 MAHESH MALHOTRA,  
S/O. LATE B. L. MALHOTRA, RESIDING AT HOUSE NO. 394, NITIKHAND - 3,



INDIRAPURAM, GHAZIABAD, UTTAR PRADESH ( SOUGHT TO BE IMPEADED )

- 5 ALL INDIA MOTOR VEHICLE SECURITY ASSOCIATION,  
45, 1ST FLOOR, COMMUNITY CENTRE, NARAINAPHASE-I, NEW DELHI, REPRESENTED  
BY ITS AUTHORIZED SIGNATORY SHRI. T.SUJITH MUGESH ( SOUGHT TO BE  
IMPEADED )

BY ADVS. SRI P SANTHOSH KUMAR (SPL GP), SRI T C KRISHNA DSGI,  
VISHNU J., CGC, MILLU DANDAPANI, HARIKUMAR G. (GOPINATHAN NAIR)

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING FINALLY HEARD ON 29.11.2024, ALONG WITH  
WP(C).10761/2022 AND CONNECTED CASES, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:



JUDGMENT

[WP(C) Nos.10761/2022, 7089/2023, 18049/2023, 22207/2023, 29866/2023, 14467/2024]

“C.R.”

Heard Mr R Ramkumar (Senior), assisted by Mr S.M. Prasanth; Dr Aditya Sondhi (Senior) assisted by Mr Binoy Vincent; Mr Naveen R Nath (Senior) assisted by Mr Chelson Chambarathy and Mr P A Mohammed Shah, learned Counsel for the petitioners; Ms T C Krishna learned DSGI, Mr Vishnu J learned CGC; Mr P Santhosh Kumar learned Special Government Pleader; Mr P A Muhammed Shah; Mr Harikumar G, Mr Mangal Pandai; Mr Aman Preeth Singh, Mr Millu Dandapani; Mr Vishnu J; Mr N N Girija and Mr V S Abhishek learned Counsel for the respondents.

**Prayers:**

2. The prayers sought in these writ petitions are summed up as follows:
  - (i) Seeks directions to the respondents to issue High-Security



Registration Plates to motor vehicles registered prior to 01.04.2019 on the strength of the Type Approval Certificate and provide access to the Vahan Portal.

(ii) Seeks directions to the respondents to strictly ensure and implement the affixation of registration mark/ High-Security Registration Plates on every motor vehicle as per Section 41(6) of the Motor Vehicles Act 1988 and rules 50, 51 and 124 of the Central Motor Vehicles Rules 1989 read with Regulation 36 of the Motor Vehicles (Driving) Regulations 2017.

(iii) To declare that a holder of a Type Approval Certificate issued by a testing agency authorized by the Centre is required to obtain approval from the State Government for issuing High-Security Registration Plates, which is violative of Articles 14, 19 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

(iv) Seeks direction to quash Advisory/Letter No.RT-11036/99/2020-



MVL dated 09.06.2023 directing all States and Union Territories to take action against High-Security Registration Plates manufacturers fixing High-Security Registration Plates without authorisation from the State Government.

(v) Seeks direction to quash Advisory/Letter No.RT-11036/99/2020-MVL dated 08.01.2024, which clarifies that the State can implement the fixation of High-Security Registration Plates through the manufacturers and dealers if the State is unable to authorize the licence plate manufacturers.

(vi) Seeks direction to quash Government Order, G.O.(Rt) No.39/2024/Trans dated 24.01.2024.

(vi) To declare that the direction to close down the petitioner's online booking centres is violative of Articles 14, 19 and 21 of the Constitution of India and that a license plate manufacturer approved by a Central Agency under Rule 126 of the Central Motor Vehicles Rules can affix





High-Security Registration Plates. [W.P.(C) No.7089/2023].

2.1 Since the common question of facts and law are involved in these petitions, they have been heard together and are being decided by the common judgment. The facts are briefly noted hereunder:

**Facts:**

3. The present batch of writ petitions have been filed primarily in respect of the implementation of High-Security Registration Plates (HSRP) in the State of Kerala on old vehicles manufactured prior to 01.04.2019 (around 75 lakhs) and the restrictions imposed by the State Government on implementing the HSRP on such vehicles. As per the petitioners' case, Rule 50 of the Central Motor Vehicle Rules 1989 read with HSRP Order, 2018 (as amended), the HSRPs are to be fixed by only those entities who are authorised by the State Government/Union Territories. Despite having the Type Approval Certificate (TAC), the State Government is not allowing the petitioners to affix HSRPs on motor



vehicles manufactured prior to 01.04.2019.

3.1 The HSRP Scheme was introduced to enhance the security of motor vehicles and facilitate their identification through a standardised registration system. It is a necessary step towards improving road safety and curbing vehicle-related offences.

4. Before adverting to the respective submissions made on behalf of the petitioners, respondents, and interveners, it would be appropriate to take note of the important provisions of the Motor Vehicles Act 1988 (for short, the ‘MV Act’), the relevant Central Motor Vehicle Rules and the HSRP Orders, as well as a few relevant judgments on the subject.

5. Section 2(37) of the MV Act defines the “*registering authority*” as an authority empowered to register motor vehicles under Chapter IV of the MV Act. The Central Government, as early as in 2001, issued The Motor Vehicles (New High-Security Registration Plates) Order 2001 (for



short, 'HSRP Order 2001'). Section 2(28) of the MV Act defines "*motor vehicle*" or "*vehicle*". Section 2(32) defines "*prescribed*" means prescribed by rules made under this Act. Section 39 of the Act lays down that no person shall drive any motor vehicle, and no owner of a motor vehicle shall cause or permit the vehicle to be driven in any public place or in any other place unless the vehicle is registered in accordance with this Chapter IV and the vehicle carries a registration mark displayed in the prescribed manner. Section 41 of the MV Act deals with '*Registration*' of the vehicle and it lays down that an application made by or on behalf of the owner of a motor vehicle for registration shall be in the prescribed form and shall be accompanied by the prescribed fee, the registering authority shall issue to the owner of a motor vehicle registered by it a certificate of registration in such form and containing such particulars and information and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Central Government. Subsection (6) of Section 41 provides the registering



authority shall assign to the vehicle, for display thereon, a distinguishing mark (referred to as the registration mark) consisting of one of the groups of such letters and followed by such letters and figures as are allotted to the State by the Central Government from time to time by notification in the Official Gazette, and displayed and shown on the motor vehicle in such form and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Central Government.

5.1 In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 64 of the MV Act and after previous publication as required under Section 212, the Central Government framed the Central Motor Vehicle Rules 1989 (for short, '1989 Rules'). Rule 50 deals with the form and manner of display of registration marks on motor vehicles. Sub-Rule (i) deals with motor vehicles, and Sub-Rule (ii) deals with motorcycles. The legal landscape concerning the implementation of HSRP has undergone significant changes, particularly following the amendment to Rule 50 of the 1989



Rules by notification dated 06.12.2018. Before the said amendment, the HSRP scheme was covered by the HSRP Order 2001, under which only the manufacturer or supplier of the HSRP selected by either State or Union Territory was permitted to supply HSRP across the entire State or specific region within the State.

6. The amended Rule 50 is reproduced below:

*“50. Form and manner of display of registration marks on the motor vehicles. (1)* On or after commencement of this rule, the registration mark referred to in sub-section (6) of Section 41 shall be displayed both at the front and at the rear of all motor vehicles clearly and legibly in the form of security licence plate of the following specifications, namely:

(i) the plate shall be a solid unit made of 1.0 mm aluminium conforming to DIN 1745/DIN 1783 or ISO 7591. Border edges and corners of the plate shall be rounded to avoid injuries to the extent of approximately 10 mm and the plates must have an embossed border. The plate shall be suitable for hot stamping and reflective sheet has to be guaranteed for imperishable nature for minimum five years. The fast colouring of legend and border to be done by hot stamping;

(ii) the plate should bear the letters 'IND' in blue colour on the extreme left centre of the plate. The letters should be one-fourth of the



size of letters mentioned in Rule 51 and should be buried into the foil or applied by hot stamping and should be an integral part of the plate;

(iii) each plate shall be protected against counterfeiting by applying chromium-based hologram, applied by hot stamping. Stickers and adhesive labels are not permitted. The plate shall bear a permanent consecutive identification number of minimum seven digits, to be laser-branded into a reflective sheeting and hot stamping film shall bear a verification inscription;

(iv) apart from the registration marks on the front and rear, the third registration mark in the form of self-destructive type, chromium-based hologram sticker shall be affixed on the left-hand top side of the windshield of the vehicle. The registration details such as registration number, registering authority etc. shall be printed on the sticker. The third registration mark shall be issued by the registering authorities/approved dealers of the licence plates manufacturer along with the e regular registration marks, and thereafter if such sticker is destroyed it shall be issued by the licence plate manufacturer or his dealer;

(v) the plate shall be fastened with non-removable/non-reusable snap-lock fitting system on rear of the vehicle at the premises of the registering authority;

The licence plates with all the above specifications and the specified f registrations for a vehicle shall be issued by the registering authority or



approved licence plates manufacturers or their dealers. The Central Road Research Institute, New Delhi or any of the agencies authorised by the Central Government shall approve the licence plates manufacturers to the above specification;

(vi) the size of the plate for different categories of vehicles shall be as follows:

For two- and three-wheelers	200 x 100 mm
For light motor vehicles/ passenger cars	340 x 200 mm/500 x 120 mm
For medium commercial vehicles, heavy commercial vehicles and trailer/combination	340 x 200 mm:

Provided that this sub-rule shall apply to already registered vehicles two years from the date of commencement:

Provided further that the size of the registration plates for agricultural tractors shall be as follows:

Front	-	285 x 45 mm
Rear	-	200 x 100 mm”

7. In the exercise of the power conferred by the sub-section (3) of section 109 of the MV Act, the Central Government issued an order known as the Motor Vehicles (New High-Security Registration Plates) Order, 2001 on 22.08.2001 in order to notify certain standards in respect of the new system of high-security registration plates for motor vehicles



and the process used by a manufacturer or vendor for manufacturing or supplying such plates with reference to the amendments made in the Central Motor Vehicles Rules, 1989 by the Central Motor Vehicles (First Amendment) Rules, 2001. Clauses 2, 3 and 4 of Order 2001 would read as under:

2. It shall come into force on the 28th day of September, 2001 in case of new registered vehicles from that date and in case of already registered vehicles, two years from the date of publication of this Order in the Official Gazette.
3. *Application.* This Order shall apply to motor vehicles as defined in clause (28) of Section 2 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (59 of 1988).
4. A manufacturer or supplier of new high-security registration plates shall comply with the following specifications, namely-
  - (i) The manufacturer or supplier shall have a certificate from the Central Road Research Institute, New Delhi or any one of the testing agencies authorised by the Central Government under Rule 126 of the Central Motor Vehicles Rules, 1989.
  - (ii) The registration plate shall conform to the specifications spelt out in Rule 50 of the Central Motor Vehicles Rules, 1989; and shall conform to DIN 1745/DIN 1783 or ISO 7591, as updated from time to time. The





registration plate has to be guaranteed for imperishable nature for a minimum of five years.

(iii) \* \* (omitted as not relevant)

(iv) To protect against counterfeiting, a chromium-based hologram of the size of 20 mm x 20 mm is to be applied by hot stamping on the top left-hand corner of the plate in both front and rear plates. The hologram shall contain the Ashoka emblem with 'Bharat Sarkar' and 'Government of India' on each side, on the left and right sides, respectively, on the Ashoka emblem vertically, as specified in the sketch, as given in the annexure annexed to this Order.

(v)-(vii) \* \*

(viii) The registration plate fitted in the rear of the vehicle shall be fastened with non-removable/non-reusable snap-lock system. For the sake of better security, at least two such snap-locks shall be fitted.

(ix) No high-security plate shall be affixed outside the premises of the registering authority.

(x) The manufacturer or the vendor selected by the State Transport Department for supply of such registration plates may be for the State as a whole or for any region of the State.

(xi) The registration plate will be supplied to the motor vehicle owners by the vendor against the authorisation by the Road Transport Officer or any officer designated for the purpose by the State Transport Department.



(xii) The replacement for any existing registration plate may be made by the transport authority concerned only after ensuring that the old plate has been surrendered and destroyed.

(xiii) A proper record of the registration plates issued by the manufacturer or the vendor, authorised by the State Government, should be maintained on a daily basis and got tallied periodically with the records of the Transport Office.

(xiv) Periodic audit shall be carried out by testing agency concerned to ensure compliance of the requirements of the high security registration plate."

7.1 The aforesaid Order was amended by notification dated 16.10.2001 issued by the Central Government in the exercise of the powers under Section 109(3) of the MV Act, and the Order so issued was called the Motor Vehicles (New High-Security Registration Plates) (Amendment) Order, 2001. By this order, certain provisions of the earlier Order of 2001 were amended, and sub-clause (v) was inserted as under:

“Provided that the permanent consecutive identification number in



Arabic numbers shall be preceded by two alphabets representing the name of the vendor or the manufacturer or the supplier, as the case may be, for whom the type of approval certificate is issued by the test agencies:”

8. The Union Territory Administration of Daman and Diu issued Notices Inviting Tenders (NITs) for appointment of the manufacture and supply of high-security registration plates for all types of vehicles. It was the subject matter of challenge before the Supreme Court in the case of the *Association of Registration Plates v Union of India*<sup>1</sup>. Paragraphs 1.5.3, 1.5.5 and 1.5.6 of the NIT approved by the Union Territory Administration of Daman and Diu which were under challenge are extracted hereunder:

“The appointment of the manufacturer shall be for the whole Union Territory.

The Director of Transport, Daman & Diu invites bids on behalf of the President of India for selection of an eligible manufacturer having type approval and requisite manufacturing capacity to produce the high

---

<sup>1</sup> (2004) 5 SCC 364



security registration plates in conformity with the specifications mentioned in the abovementioned amendments.

1.5. *Eligible bidders.* This invitation for bid is open to all the bidders who fulfil all the following criteria on cumulative basis.

1.5.3. The bidder or the promoter or any of the members of joint venture should have sufficient experience in the field of registration plates and should be working in at least three countries for registration plates having security features worldwide or in minimum three such projects (necessary credentials from the Government of such country should be attached along with a pro forma as per Annexure XI duly filled in).

1.5.5. The bidder or the joint-venture partners together must have a minimum net worth equivalent to Indian rupees 40 crores (bank solvency certificate to be produced).

1.5.6. The bidders or the joint-venture partners together must have a minimum annual turnover equivalent to Indian rupees 50 crores in the immediately preceding last year and at least 15% of this turnover must be from the registration plate business. Certificate confirming above and certification of minimum 15% turnover being from registration plate business will have to be provided duly attested by a Chartered Accountant/any bank to be attached in support of fulfilment of this condition."



9. In *Signs India v. Union of India*<sup>2</sup>, NITs issued by the State of Pondicherry and the State of West Bengal were challenged which contain more or less similar clauses. The eligibility criteria of clause 1.5.3 issued by the State of Pondicherry required that the bidder, the promoter or any of the members of the joint venture should have sufficient experience in the field of registration plates and should be working in a minimum of five countries with registration plates having security features. Clause 1.5.6 required that the bidder or the joint venture partners together must have a minimum annual turnover equivalent to Indian Rs.75 crores in the immediately preceding last year, and at least 15 % of this turnover must be from the registration plates business. Clause 1.5.5 issued by the State of West Bengal required that the bidder or the joint venture partners together must have a minimum net worth equivalent to Indian Rs.50 crores and Clause 1.5.6 required

---

<sup>2</sup> W.P.(C) No.395 of 2003 filed under Article 32 of the Constitution of India



that the bidders or the joint venture partners together must have a minimum annual turnover equivalent to Indian Rs.50 crores during the preceding financial year, i.e., 2002-23 and 25% of this amount should have come from high-security registration plate business.

10. The grievance of the writ petitioners before the Supreme Court was that clause 4(x) of the Order 2001, which provided that the manufacturer or the vendor selected by the State Transport Department for supply of such registration plates could be for the State as a whole or for any region of the State. The petitioners who had 'Type Approval Certificate' from the test agencies, CRRI, ARAI or VRDE for the High-Security Registration Plates as per the Gazette notification challenged the procedure adopted by the various State Governments inviting bids for the purposes of selecting and appointing only one manufacturer of HSRP for supplying the registration plates for all the motor vehicles and two-wheelers in the entire State.



10.1 Hon'ble Justice (Retd.) G P Mathur, who authored the judgment, held that once approval was given to a licence plate manufacturer by the Central Road Research Institute, New Delhi or any of the agencies authorized by the Central Government, became eligible to supply HSRP (licence plates). It was also held that since HSRPs were sought to be introduced for the first time in the country under Rule 50 by amendment in the said Rule with effect from 28.03.2001, any clause in NIT which required that the tenderer or bidder or joint venture partner should have a turnover of Rs.50 crores in the immediately preceding/last year and at least 25% of this turnover must be from the licence plates business, would mean that it would be a foreign company. It was further held that no Indian company could have a turnover of that magnitude in the preceding year as the HSRP scheme was introduced in India for the first time after the amendment was brought in Rule 50 with effect from 28.03.2001. The clear impact of this condition would be that



all Indian companies would be ousted even though they could have the technical competence to manufacture HSRP and have the requisite approval from the body or agencies mentioned in Rule 50 of Rules 1989. These conditions could be met only by those whose joint venture partners would be foreign companies and were already dealing with such types of license plates. It was, therefore, held that the condition in NITs regarding the turnover of a particular amount in the preceding year coupled with 15% or 25% of the said turnover in the business of manufacturing licence plates and the condition regarding experience in three to five countries were wholly arbitrary and have no rational basis. The main conditions were, therefore, struck down.

10.2 The Hon'ble Judge was also of the view that no order concerning a number plate simpliciter could be issued by the Central Government in the exercise of powers conferred by Sub-Section (3) of Section 109 of the MV Act inasmuch as under sub-section (3) of Section





109 of the MV Act, the Central Government could prescribe the standards for any article or process used by a manufacturer of motor vehicles and the power under this provision could therefore be exercised by the Central Government for prescribing the standard of the materials or articles or any process used as such in the manufacturing of the vehicle. It was also held that there was no scope for issuing the HSRP Order 2001 in the exercise of the power conferred by Section 109(3) of the MV Act. It was therefore held that Clause 4(x) of the Order 2001 dated 22.08.2001 would not have been issued by the Central Government in the exercise of the power conferred by Section 109(3) of the MV Act and Order 2001 was held to be *ultra vires* and it was quashed.

10.3 However, Hon'ble Justice Rajendra Babu, Chief Justice of India (Retd.) did not agree with the view taken by Hon'ble Justice G P Mathur. He was of the view that the object of the relevant provisions under challenge was not to create a monopoly in favour of any person and



clause 4(x) of the HSRP Order issued by the Central Government did not deserve to be quashed.

11. A Three-Judge Bench of the Supreme Court in the case *Association of Registration Plates v. Union of India*<sup>3</sup> did not agree with the view taken by Hon'ble Justice G P Mathur. In the said judgment, the Three-Judge Bench considered the object of the HSRP scheme to curb the increasing menace of vehicle thefts and their usage in the commission of crimes like murder, dacoity, kidnapping, etc. and the urgent need to check the usage of motor vehicles in terrorist activities. Rule 50 of the 1989 Rules was amended to prescribe the specification of HSRPs for different categories of vehicles.

11.1 The main features of the high-security registration plates as provided in Rule 50 and the Order of 2001 were noted as under:

- “1. It provides for a solid aluminium plate.
2. The plate should be suitable for hot stamping and would be a reflective

---

<sup>3</sup> (2005) 1 SCC 679



sheet.

3. The plate should bear the letters "IND" in blue colour.

4. It should have a chromium-based hologram which shall also be hot-stamped.

5. There would be a third registration mark which would be self-reflective being a chromium-based hologram sticker and which would be affixed on the windshield of the vehicle.

6. The plate on the rear shall be fastened with a non-removable/ non-reusable snap-lock fitting system.”

12. The aforesaid features in the High-Security Registration Plates were said to have been insisted upon for the following reasons:

“1. Hot chromium-based hologram would prevent counterfeiting.

2. The ingress letter "IND" on the plate would secure national identity and standardisation.

3. The manufacturer's laser-etched seven-digit code for each plate is intended to sequentially identify individual registration plates across the country. This code would act as a watermark and would not be erasable by any mechanical or technical process.

4. Snap-lock to be fitted on the rear portions of the vehicle would be tamper-proof. Any attempt to remove the plate would break it.

5. The reflective sheet of superior grade would be visible from a minimum



of 200 metres.

6. The alphanumerical would be easily readable and identifiable.

7. On the alphanumerical border, the ingress letters "IND" would prevent painting and screen printing, which would protect against counterfeiting.”

8. The sticker to be affixed on the windshield would have a seven-digit laser code containing the engine number and the chassis number. This is so designed as to be self-destructive upon removal.”

13. The Court held that the State, as the implementing authority, has to ensure that the scheme of High-Security Vehicle Registration Plates was effectively implemented. Keeping in view the enormous work involved in switching over to new plates within two years for existing vehicles of such large numbers in each State, resorting to a “trial-and-error” method would prove hazardous. Therefore, the State would have the right to select the most competent person for doing the job. The insistence of the State to select an experienced manufacturer with sound financial and technical capability could not be violative of Articles 14 and



19(1)(g) of the Constitution of India. The Three-Judge Bench upheld the tender conditions and the time period of 15 years to the selected tenderers for affixing the HSRPs on the vehicles.

13.1 In substance, it was held that possession of a Type Approval Certificate could not be enough to award the work, but to ensure quality of supply of HSRPs for old vehicles and periodical supply for new vehicles for a long period, only a manufacturer who would be sound both technically and financially should be selected. It was further held by the Three-Judge Bench that keeping in view the nature of the contract and job involved, particularly its magnitude and the huge investment for infrastructure required, an attempt should be to select such a manufacturer who has the technical and financial capability and collaboration with foreign companies and experience in foreign countries should not be held to be a deliberate attempt on the part of the State authorities to eliminate indigenous manufacturers.



13.2 The Three-Judge Bench was also of the opinion that in the matter of formulating conditions of a tender document and awarding the contract of the nature of ensuring the supply of HSRPs, greater latitude would be required to be conceded to the State Authorities. Unless the action of the Authority would be malicious or a misuse of its statutory powers, tender conditions should not be interfered with. It was also held that selecting one manufacturer through the process of open competition would not be a creation of any monopoly, and neither would it be in violation of Article 19(1)(g) of the Constitution of India read with clause (6) of the said Article. Paragraph 40 of the said judgment is extracted hereunder:

“40. Selecting one manufacturer through a process of open competition is not creation of any monopoly, as contended, in violation of Article 19(1)(g) of the Constitution read with clause (6) of the said article. As is sought to be pointed out, the implementation involves large network of operations of highly sophisticated materials. The manufacturer has to have embossing stations within the premises of the RTO. He has to



maintain the data of each plate which he would be getting from his main unit. It has to be cross-checked by the RTO data. There has to be a server in the RTO's office which is linked with all RTOS in each State and thereon linked to the whole nation. Maintenance of the record by one and supervision over its activity would be simpler for the State if there is one manufacturer instead of multi-manufacturers as suppliers. The actual operation of the scheme through the RTOs in their premises would get complicated and confused if multi-manufacturers are involved. That would also seriously impair the high security concept in affixation of new plates on the vehicles. If there is a single manufacturer he can be forced to go and serve rural areas with thin vehicular population and less volume of business. Multi-manufacturers might concentrate only on urban areas with higher vehicular population.”

14. The Three-Judge Bench of the Supreme Court rejected the submission of the petitioner in the said case that the use of the word ‘*approved*’ in para 2 of clause (v) of Rule 50(1) should not be construed to mean ‘*selected*’ through notice inviting tenders. The reading of Rule 50(1) would rule out the selection of a sole manufacturer through a tender process. The Supreme Court also rejected the contention of the



petitioners that the true interpretation of Rule 50(1) would be that the registration plates could either be issued by the RTO to the exclusion of all others or all Type Approval-Certificate holders should be allowed to do business of supply in the open market. Furthermore, it was held that para 2 of clause (v) of Rule 50(1) would not indicate any prohibition of selection of an approved plate manufacturer for assisting the registering authority to implement the scheme of affixation of high-security registration plates to the existing vehicles and new vehicles.

14.1 Paragraphs 46 to 48 of the said judgment are extracted hereunder:

“46. Learned counsel for the petitioners argues that the use of the word "approved" in para 2 of clause (v) of Rule 50(1) has to be given its natural meaning and cannot be read to mean "selected" through notice inviting tenders. In this respect, it is further submitted that the rule-making authority has used the words "approved" and "approve" twice in the same paragraph. The Rule read harmoniously rules out selection of a sole manufacturer through a tender process. The argument in substance is that every approved licence plate manufacturer can be entrusted with





the job of supplying the registration plates and selection of one manufacturer for the job is against the intendment of the Rule.

47. The above argument seems attractive but on closer scrutiny is unacceptable. The Rule is interpreted to mean that the registration plates can either be issued by the RTO to the exclusion of all others or all type-approval-certificate holders must be allowed to do business of supply in open market. In other words, according to the petitioners, the Rule contemplates that if the registering authority does not supply the plates itself, it allows all TAC-holders to do the business without any restriction.

48. In interpreting the Rule, the object of the scheme providing for the affixation of high-security plates has to be kept in view. Where the RTO himself is not making the supply of plates, an approved registration plate manufacturer can be selected for supply. The legal obligation on the registering authority under Rule 50(1)(v) to issue specified kinds of registration plates implies issuance of such registration plates through a selected approved plate manufacturer. Para 2 of clause (v) of Rule 50(1), if reasonably construed, does not indicate any prohibition of selection of an approved plate manufacturer for assisting the registering authority to implement the scheme of affixation of high-security registration plates to existing vehicles and new vehicles. Such an interpretation fulfils the object of the scheme. The interpretation sought to be placed by the petitioners on the said para of the Rule would result in frustrating the high-security aspect and object of the scheme of affixation of high-



security registration plates on vehicles.”

14.2 The Three-Judge Bench further upheld the *vires* para 4(x) of the HSRP Order 2001 and it was held that the registration plates were not manufactured by the manufacturer of motor vehicles but for the maintenance and operation of motor vehicles registration plates were necessary. Therefore, the manufacturers of the registration plates could be subjected to certain standards by a statutory order to be notified and published in accordance with sub-section (3) of Section 109 of the MV Act. Paragraph 53 of the said judgment is extracted hereunder:

“53. The above arguments based on Section 109(3) and the other provisions in Chapter IV of the Act have been suitably replied to by the counsel appearing for the respondents. The reasoning advanced on behalf of the respondents is worthy of acceptance. The Statutory Order of 2001 is expressly issued under Section 109(3) of the Act, which no doubt is concerned with the construction, equipment and maintenance of motor vehicles. Sub-section (3) of Section 109 permits the Central Government to "notify that any article or process used by a manufacturer shall conform to such standard as prescribed". The word "manufacturer"



is defined in Section 2(21-A) of the Act to mean a person engaged in the manufacture of motor vehicles but the definition clause is prefixed by the words "unless the context otherwise requires". In the context of sub-section (3) of Section 109, an article to be affixed to the motor vehicle like a high-security registration plate is covered by the use of the expression "any article or process used by a manufacturer". "In the context" if the provision contained in sub-section (3) b is read reasonably, an article which is adjunct or necessarily attachable to a motor vehicle, would also be covered in the said expression. The Statutory Order of 2001 is published in the Official Gazette. It does not fall outside the scope of sub-section (3) of Section 109 of the Act. The expression "any article or process used by a manufacturer" has to be construed "in the context" so as not to restrict the expression "manufacturer" to only manufacturer of motor vehicles as defined under Section 2(21-A) of the Act. The definition in the Act has to be construed according to the "context", and if the "context" otherwise indicates, a meaningful interpretation is to be given to the words "any article or process used by a manufacturer" as used in sub-section (3) of Section 109 of the Act. Registration plates are not manufactured by the manufacturer of motor vehicles but for maintenance and operation of motor vehicles registration plates are necessary. Therefore, manufacturers of registration plates can be subjected to certain standards by a statutory order to be notified and published in accordance with sub-section (3) of Section 109 of the Act.



Any restrictive interpretation of the said sub-section is neither called for from the language of the sub-section nor the object of the provision. Reference is made to the opinion of learned Brother G.P. Mathur, J., in these cases. For the reasons mentioned by us above, in our e opinion, the statutory Order of 2001 and clause 4(x) thereof cannot be held to be beyond the purview of sub-section (3) of Section 109 of the Act. Clause 4(x) of the statutory Order of 2001 could be issued under Section 109(3) as an aid to the fulfilment of provisions of high-security registration plates contained in Rule 50. Such power of the State to issue an order containing clause 4(x) is not only supported by sub-section (3) of Section 109 but by f Rule 50 itself. Clause 4(x) of the statutory Order of 2001 is merely an enabling one and restates what Rule 50 contemplates. We also find force in the alternative submission made on behalf of the respondents that the statutory order, including clause 4(x), can be supported as having been issued in the exercise of executive power of the Central Government, which is coextensive with its legislative power.”

15. What are the main features of the High-Security Registration Plates as provided in Rule 50 came up for consideration again before the Supreme Court in *Maninderjit Singh Bitta v. Union of India*<sup>4</sup> and the view

---

<sup>4</sup> (2008) 7 SCC 328



taken in *Association of Registration Plates* [2005 1 SCC 679] (supra) was reiterated. The petitioners in *Maninderjit Singh Bitta* (supra) had a grievance that subsequent to the judgment by the Three-Judge Bench in *Association of Registration Plates* [2005 1 SCC 679] (supra), the scheme of HSRP was not implemented in any State except in the State of Meghalaya and the other States were still repeating the processing of tender. The prayer was that the purpose of introducing the scheme should be fulfilled in letter and spirit. There should be no lethargy when the question of public safety and security is involved. The Supreme Court directed the States to take necessary decisions, if not already taken, within a period of six months for implementing the HSRP. Paragraphs 8 and 9 of the said judgment are extracted hereunder:

“8. Without going into the question as to whether the petition is a bonafide Public Interest Petition, we feel it would be in the interest of all concerned if the States and the Union Territories take definite decision as to whether there is need for giving effect to the amended Rule 50 and the Scheme of HSRP and the modalities to be followed.



9. Needless to say the scheme appears to have been introduced keeping in view the public safety and security of the citizens. Let necessary decisions be taken, if not already taken, within a period of six months from today. While taking the decision, the aspects highlighted by this Court in the earlier decision, needless to say, shall be kept in view.”

16. In *Shimnit Utsch India Pvt.Ltd. v. West Bengal Tpt. Infrastructure*<sup>5</sup> the Supreme Court upheld the conditions in NIT for HSRPs for motor vehicles which were at variance with the conditions prescribed in the case of *Association of Registration Plates* [2005 1 SCC 679] (supra) wherein the State Government issuing fresh NITs deleted the conditions for award of tender including experience in the field of registration plates in foreign countries and prescribing minimum turnover from such business.

16.1 The Supreme Court held that the Government policy can be changed with changing circumstances, and only on the ground of change

---

<sup>5</sup> 2010 (6) SCC 303



the policy cannot be vitiated. The Government has the discretion to adopt a different policy, alter or change its policy to serve the public interest and make it more effective. However, change in policy must be in conformity with *Wednesbury's* reasonableness and free from arbitrariness, irrationality, bias and malice. Paragraphs 51 to 55 and 64, which are relevant are extracted hereunder:

“51. In the PIL filed by *Maninderjit Singh Bitta*, it was prayed that the States and UTs be directed to implement the judgment of this Court in ***Association of Registration Plates***. This Court disposed of the writ petition on May 8, 2008 by observing, ‘we feel it would be in the interest of all concerned if the States and Union Territories take definite decision as to whether there is need for giving effect to the amended Rule 50 and the scheme of HSRP and the modalities to be followed’. It was further observed that while taking the decision, the aspects highlighted by this Court in ***Association of Registration Plates*** shall be kept in view. After disposal of the PIL, the petitioner therein filed I.A. No. 5 for clarification of the order dated May 8, 2008 and this Court while disposing of the said I.A. on May 5, 2009 clarified that there was no discretion given to the States/UTs not to give effect to the amended Rule 50 and the claim of HSRP and the modalities to be followed. Thereafter, I.A. was filed by the Central Government on September 17, 2009 before this



Court for extension of time wherein the following statement was made:

"The primary reason for non implementation of the scheme has been the challenges to certain conditions of the tender floated by various States. The issues such as experience in foreign countries, minimum net worth and turnover with a certain prescribed percentage of turn over from number plate business in the immediately preceding last three years and long term contract to a single vendor for the entire State had been the subject matter of WP(C) No.41 of 2003 – Association of Registration Plates v, UOI. That this Hon'ble Court in the judgment dated 30th November, 2004, laid to rest all such issues by holding that all such conditions were essential and mandatory conditions of the HSRP tender to ensure that the vendors selected by the States would be technically and financially competent to fulfill the contractual obligations which looking to the magnitude of the job requires huge investment qualitatively and quantitatively."

By order dated December 15, 2009, this Court extended the time for implementation of HSRP upto May 31, 2010. None of these orders holds that while implementing the new system of HSRP, States and UTs are bound to incorporate the conditions of foreign experience and minimum turnover from that business. The statement made by the Central Government in its application as aforementioned only reflected the reason for non-implementation of HSRP scheme. As a matter of fact, the Central Government has clarified the position in its communication with the States/UTs that draft tender conditions circulated by them are only suggestive. Be that as it may. The decision of this Court in **Maninderjit Singh Bitta** and the subsequently clarificatory order therein are hardly relevant and do not help the case of the appellants.

52. It is important to notice that the bids pursuant to the second NIT have





been evaluated by WBTIDCL and we have been informed that the lowest bid per HSRP unit for a vehicle is Rs. 469/- while the offer made by **Shimnit** (appellant) is of about Rs. 1200/-. Such a huge difference in the rate per HSRP unit shows that the action of the State Government in doing away with the conditions of experience in foreign countries and prescribed turnover from such business has been in larger public interest without compromising on safety, security and quality or sustainable capacity.

53. Mr. F.S. Nariman, learned senior counsel contended that cancellation of first NIT and issuance of second NIT by the Government of West Bengal was actuated with malafides as **Shimnit** had challenged the pre-qualification of Promuk by filing a writ petition before the Calcutta High Court wherein an interim order also came to be passed. We are not impressed by this submission at all and it is noted to be rejected. There is no material much less substantial material to infer any malafides. Merely because Shimnit challenged the pre-qualification of Promuk before Calcutta High Court, it could hardly lead to an inference of malafides.

54. It is true that the State or its tendering authority is bound to give effect to essential conditions of eligibility stated in a tender document and is not entitled to waive such conditions but that does not take away its administrative discretion to cancel the entire tender process in public interest provided such action is not actuated with ulterior motive or is otherwise not vitiated by any vice of arbitrariness or irrationality or in violation of some statutory provisions. It is always open to the State to give



effect to new policy which it wished to pursue keeping in view 'overriding public interest' and subject to principles of Wednesbury reasonableness. The judgment of Guwahati High Court in ***Real Mazon India Ltd. V. State of Assam*** was also pressed into service by the appellants. In that case, the corrigenda dated December 26, 2006, January 6, 2007 and January 16, 2007 issued by the State of Assam deleting the conditions of experience, expertise and exposure of the bidders in the manufacture and supply of HSRP were challenged. Guwahati High Court quashed the impugned corrigenda. We are unable to approve the judgment of the Guwahati High Court in ***Real Mazon India Ltd.*** for the reasons given above.

55. As regards the State of Orissa, it is an admitted position that it issued NIT for the first time on April 11, 2007 inviting bids for the manufacture and supply of HSRP in respect of the existing motor vehicles and vehicles to be registered in the State of Orissa. The said NIT was not taken to logical conclusion and a fresh NIT was issued on July 6, 2009 on BOO 2008 (1) GLT 1020 basis. In that NIT, inter alia, eligibility criteria has been provided that bidder should have experience of working in the field of HSRP having used the security features as mentioned in Rule 50 of 1989 Rules. However, NIT does not insist on conditions like experience in the foreign countries and minimum prescribed turnover from the said business. In what we have already discussed above, no case for judicial review or intervention in the said NIT is made out.”



17. Before the Supreme Court in *Maninderjit Singh Bitta v. Union of India*<sup>6</sup> the State of Kerala took the stand that in three cities, i.e., Trivandrum, Cochin and Calicut, the tender documents for manufacture and procurement of HSRP had already been issued and further steps were being taken to implement the Scheme. The Supreme Court directed the State Government to implement the Scheme at the earliest. Paragraph 9 of the said judgment passed by the Supreme Court is extracted hereunder:

“9. This is how all these three applications came up for hearing before the Court. The matter was heard and reserved for orders on 11.03.2011. During the course of the hearing, the learned Counsel, appearing on behalf of the State of Kerala, had pointed out that in three cities, i.e., Trivandrum, Cochin and Calicut, the tender documents for manufactured and procurement of HSRP have already been issued, and further steps are being taken to implement the Scheme. It was not pressed by the State of Kerala that it should be allowed to complete the implementation of the Scheme and the statutory provisions in a phased manner as it would ensure its best to implement the same in the extended period or at the earliest.”

---

<sup>6</sup> (2011) 11 SCC 315



17.1 A Three-Judge Bench in *Maninderjit Singh Bitta v. Union of India*<sup>7</sup> noted that the HSRP, despite the directions issued by the Supreme Court *vide* orders dated 30.08.2011 and 13.10.2011 for regulating the issuance and fixation of HSRP, were not fully implemented by the majority of the States/UTs. And in any case, not with required expeditiousness. The progress made by the States/UTs in implementing the HSRP was taken note of by the Supreme Court. The State Government, in its affidavit filed and the stand taken before the Supreme Court on behalf of the State of Kerala, NIT was published, but the validity of the earlier tender expired on 29.06.2011. The Supreme Court passed the following general directions in the said judgment, which are mentioned in paragraph 53 of the judgment and the said portion is extracted hereunder:

“53. Thus, we also pass the following general directions:

---

<sup>7</sup> (2012) 1 SCC 707



1. Affidavits of compliance and undertakings to comply with the directions of the Court, as contained in different orders of this Court, should be filed within four weeks from 25-11-2011. The affidavits-cum- undertakings shall be filed by the Secretary (Transport) and the Commissioner (Transport) of the respective States and Union Territories. The time schedule specified in this order shall be strictly adhered to. We make it clear that no further time shall be granted by the Court for this purpose.
2. In the event of default and non-compliance with any of the directions contained in this order by any authority, this Court would be compelled to initiate proceedings against such officer/officers in accordance with the provisions of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, without any further notice to them.
3. This matter shall be listed before the Registrar (Judl.) of this Court on 5-1-2012. The Registrar shall verify and submit a report to this Court as to which of the States/Union Territories and their respective officers have not complied with the directions of this Court as contained in this order. The report of the Registrar shall be submitted and the matter be placed before the Court on 20-1-2012.
4. We are of the considered view that various matters pending before this Court, wherein challenge has been raised to the tender process commenced and/or finalised by the respective States/Union Territories for implementation of the HSRP scheme, should be listed before one and the same court. Then alone, the effective implementation of the directions of



the Court is possible. Thus, the matter should be placed before the Hon'ble the Chief Justice on the administrative side for appropriate orders at the earliest.

5. On behalf of the petitioner and some of the States, a question has been raised before us that contractors have responded to the notices for tender in consortium. This is being done primarily for the purpose of satisfying the condition of specialised experience for manufacture and affixation of HSRP. However, after award of the contract, the partner possessing expertise (Type Approval Certificate, approval, etc.) in the consortium may walk out from the performance of the contract. In this circumstance, the very purpose would stand frustrated. We find merit in this submission but would refrain from issuing any direction in that behalf, at this stage. It will be for the State/Union Territory concerned to take appropriate decision with reference to the facts of a given case and in accordance with law. Prima facie, it appears to us that it would be in the interest of all concerned that all the members of the consortium including the member possessing the expertise should continue as such till the performance of the contract.

6. In the interest of justice and to ensure proper implementation of the judgments and directions of this Court, as contained in its various orders, in regard to manufacturing and affixation of the HSRP, it is imperative for this Court to direct that it will be in the fitness of things and even judicial propriety would demand that no High Court should pass any interim orders cancelling or staying the tender process in t relation to implementation of



the scheme. While so directing, we grant liberty to the parties to make a mention before this Court after they have instituted their petitions, if any, before the High Court and interim orders have been declined in furtherance of the observations afore made.”

17.2 A Three-Judge Bench of the Supreme Court again passed an order in *Maninderjit Singh Bitta v. Union of India*<sup>8</sup> the Supreme Court noted that sufficient time has elapsed but default on the part of some States in complying with the directions issued by the Supreme Court still persisted. The Supreme Court further noted that seven years have elapsed but some States have not even taken initial steps to implement the HSRP schemes in their respective States. There was no State in the entire country which has successfully, in accordance with the statutory provisions and Scheme, as approved by the Supreme Court, implemented the Scheme in its entirety. In paragraph 4 of the said judgment, the Supreme Court noted:

---

<sup>8</sup> (2011) 14 SCC 273



“... that in the process of selection, the States were expected to invite tenders and were even given the liberty to consult experts prior to finalising such tenders. The registration plates were then to be affixed by the selected tenderers at the Regional Transport Office of a District or State. The object of the ordinance and the judgment of this Court were to preserve public security and safety by ensuring that every vehicle in the State is fixed with HSRP and no part of the Country remains where the Scheme was not implemented.”

17.3 Even after more than 13 years, the State of Kerala has not made any progress in fixing the HSRP on vehicles manufactured before 01.04.2019. Way back on 05.05.2009, the Supreme Court in *Maninderjit Singh Bitta v. Union of India*<sup>9</sup> [I.A. No.5 in W.P.(C) No.510/2005] made it clear that no discretion was given to the State/UTs not to give effect to the amended Rule 50 in implementing the Scheme of HSRP and the modalities to be followed. The States were given six months’ time to implement the Rule. However, we have not made any progress.

---

<sup>9</sup> 2009 SCC Online SC 7





17.4 The Supreme Court had deprecated and disallowed the steps taken by the State for the selection of the vendors for supplying and fixing the HSRP on the motor vehicles. The Supreme Court held that the State would not approve all private vendors with Type Approval Certificates (TAC) from the Central Government to affix HSRPs at their own premises or at the Office of the RTO.

18. The Supreme Court in its judgment dated 13.07.2016 passed in *Maninderjit Singh Bitta v. Vijay Chhibber*<sup>10</sup> held that for valid implementation of the Scheme of HSRPs and ensuring technical and security standards as per the law and the HSRP scheme, the responsibility is on the Central Government and the State Governments and testing agencies to ensure that the standards are not compromised by the manufacturers.

18.1 The Supreme Court directed that the Central Government

---

<sup>10</sup> (2016) 14 SCC 72



ensure regular checking of manufacturing units and regular assessment, audit, and review of production. The testing agencies are also required to check plates and take stern action against manufacturers wherever necessary. The testing agencies were directed to conduct periodic assessments, reviews, and audits so that the quality and specifications are not compromised. The Supreme Court also directed the State Governments to conduct a transparent tender process and consider all factors before accepting the bids for supplying and fixing the HSRP on the motor vehicles. Paragraph 39.18 of the said order is extracted hereunder:

“39.18 The Central Government and the State Governments are directed to strictly regulate as well as monitor the implementation as per the provisions of law including the provisions of the Motor Vehicles (New High-Security Registration Plates) Order, 2001 and aforesaid directions issued by this Court.”

19. From the aforesaid, it is evident that the Supreme Court has been seized of the matter for implementing the HSRP scheme on new



and old vehicles to ensure the safety and security of the vehicles and the general public strictly in accordance with the Rules framed by the Central Government in this regard, particularly Rule 50 of the 1989 Rules. Several orders have been passed. However, the State of Kerala has been lagging behind in implementing the said Scheme for reasons best known to it.

20. The Central Government has amended Rule 50 of the 1989 Rules by notification dated 06.12.2018. Clause 5(i) of this notification specifies that for newer vehicles manufactured after 01.04.2019, the vehicle manufacturer is solely responsible for affixing the registration mark (HSRP) on the vehicles. This task may be carried out by the vehicle dealer who acts on behalf of the manufacturer. The petitioners and the interveners are conducting the affixation of HSRP as an Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM) for newer vehicles under the aforesaid notification dated 06.12.2018. They are engaged in the business of



supplying HSRPs through contracts with the vehicle manufacturers. Clause 5(ii) of the said notification is in respect of vehicles manufactured prior to 01.04.2019 and provides that the HSRP scheme for these vehicles can be implemented either through the vehicle manufacturer or through suppliers of the HSRP authorized by the respective State Government or Union Territory.

20.1 The relevant extract of the notification dated 06.12.2018 would read as under:

**S.O. 6052(E) dated 6th December 2018**

"5.(i) For the affixation of HSRP on existing vehicles, the high-security registration plate, including the third registration mark, may be supplied and affixed by the dealers of the vehicle manufacturers after placing the mark of registration thereon.

(ii) The manufacturers or suppliers of high-security registration plates, if so, authorised by the state concerned, may also supply the high-security registration plate including the third registration mark on old vehicles after placing the registration mark."

21. Another notification dated 11.02.2020, brought another



amendment to Rule 50 of the 1989 Rules. Under this amendment, the HSRPs on vehicles manufactured prior to 01.04.2019 could be affixed by:

- i. The registering authority,
- ii. The vehicle manufacturers and their dealers,
- iii. The license plate manufacturers and their dealers, provided they are approved by the State Government or Union Territory.

The State Government does not have the infrastructure/ technical know-how to manufacture the HSRP. However, it can implement the Scheme by tendering among the TAC entities.

21.1 The notification dated 11.02.2020 reads as under:

“ ...

The license plates with all the above specifications and the specified registrations for a new vehicle shall be issued by the registering authority or vehicle manufacturers and their dealers, and for existing old, registered vehicles shall be issued by the registering authority or vehicle manufacturers and their dealers or by the approved license plate manufacturers or their dealers.

...”

From the notification dated 11.02.2020, it is evident that unless a license



plate manufacturer or its dealer is approved/selected by the State Government or Union Territory for affixing the HSRP in the respective State or Union Territory, it cannot be allowed to affix, sell or supply HSRP on the old vehicles. The petitioners have contended that once the petitioners have been granted TAC, *i.e.*, they possess the valid license to manufacture the HSRP, no further approval is required from the State Government or Union Territories.

22. It is relevant to mention that the amended Rule 50 of 1989 Rules is not in challenge in these writ petitions. It would be apt to take note of the relevant extracts of the notifications/Circulars issued by the Ministry of Road Transport and Highways:

**“GSR 1162 (E) dated 4th December 2018**

2(i) "Provided that the High Security Registration Plate including the third registration mark, wherever required, shall be supplied by the vehicle manufacturers along with the vehicles manufactured on or after the 1st day of April, 2019 to their dealers and dealers shall place a mark of registration on such plates and affix them on the vehicle.



Provided further that the dealers of the vehicle manufacturers may also affix such plates, supplied by the vehicle manufacturers, on old vehicles after placing the registration mark of registration thereon."

**S.O. 6052(E) dated 6th December 2018**

"5. (i) For the affixation of HSRP on existing vehicles, the high security registration plate including the third registration mark may be supplied and affixed by the dealers of the vehicle manufacturers after placing the mark of registration thereon.

(ii) The manufacturers or suppliers of high security registration plates, if so, authorised by the state concerned, may also supply the high security registration plate including the third registration mark on old vehicles after placing the registration mark."

**MOM dated 04 October 2019**

"10. For the issue of providing and fixation of HSRP on existing vehicles, JS(MVL) brought to notice that as per the GSRR 1162 (E) dated 4th December 2018, State Government has to take a decision that either the HSRP plates be supplied through the authorized OEM dealers or select HSRP manufacturers."

**GSR 104 (E) dated 11.02.2020 and G.S.R. 640(E) dated 18.08.2022.**

"...and for existing old, registered vehicle shall be issued by registering authority or vehicle manufacturers and their dealers or by the approved license plate manufacturers or their dealers. Further approved license plate manufacturers or their dealers was substituted with approved license plate



manufacturers, or their dealers approved by the State Government or Union Territory Administration.

**MORTH Circular dated 16th September 2020**

"4. For the affixation of High Security Registration Plate on existing vehicles, the High Security Registration Plate including the third registration mark may be supplied and affixed either by the dealers of the vehicle manufactured after placing the mark of registration thereon or by the manufacturers or suppliers of High Security Registration Plats, if so authorized by the State concerned."

**MORTH Circular dated 1" September 2021**

"2 B. Further, Rule 5 of HSRP Order, 2018 has made provisions for affixation of HSRP on existing vehicles as under: -

- i. The HSRP, including the third registration mark, may be supplied, and affixed by the dealers of vehicle manufacturers after placing the mark of registration thereon.
- ii. The manufacturers or suppliers of HSRP, if so authorised by the State concerned, may also supply the HSRP including the third registration mark on old vehicles.

C. For the older vehicles if so, directed by the State Government, it was discussed and clarified that the dealers of the particular OEM can supply for their brand as the spirit of the amendment is that the OEM shall be responsible for the security features of the HSRP.

F. "for existing old registered vehicle shall be issued by the registering





authority or vehicle manufacturers and their dealers or by the approved licence plate manufacturers or their dealers."

**MORTH Advisory dated 9th June 2023**

"3. (v) for existing old registered vehicle shall be issued by registering authority or vehicle manufacturers and their dealers or by the licence plate manufacturers or their dealers approved by the State Government or Union Territory Administration. Provided that the High Security Registration Plate including the third registration mark, wherever required, shall be supplied by the vehicle manufacturers along with the vehicle manufactured on or after 1st day of April, 2019 to their dealers and dealers shall place a mark of registration on such plates and affix them on the vehicle. Provided further that the dealers of the manufacturer may also affix such plates supplied by the vehicle manufacturer on old vehicles.

4b. for existing old registered vehicle, shall be issued by registering authority, or vehicle manufacturers and their dealer, or by the licence plate manufacturers or their dealers approved by the State Government or Union Territory Administration."

**MORTH Advisory dated 14th July 2023**

"2. As per clause (v) of sub-rule (1) of rule 50 of CMV Rules, 1989, The HSRPs with all the requisite specifications-

b. for existing old, registered vehicle, shall be issued by registering authority, or vehicle manufacturers and their dealer, or by the licence plate manufacturers or their dealers approved by the State Government or Union



Territory Administration."

**MORTH Circular dated 29th December 2023**

"2 (iii) The sub-rule (vi) of rule 50 CMVR, 1989 provides that the High-Security Registration Plate including the third registration mark, wherever required, shall be supplied by the vehicle manufacturers along with the vehicles manufactured on or after 1 day of April, 2019 to their dealers and dealers shall place a mark of registration on such plates and affix them on the vehicle. Further the dealers of vehicle manufacturers may also affix such plates, supplied by the vehicle manufacturers, on old vehicles after placing the registration mark. The manufacturers or suppliers of high-security registration plates, if so, authorised by the state concerned, may also supply the high-security registration plate including the third registration mark on old vehicles after placing the registration mark."

**MORTH Circular dated 8th January 2024**

"2 ii. For vehicles manufactured before 01.04.2019, the HSRP shall be issued at the option of State Government/UT by:

- a. registering authority, or
- b. vehicle manufacturers and their dealers, or
- c. licence plate manufacturers or their dealers, approved by the State Government or Union Territory Administration.

6. As highlighted above, while States / UTs can opt for the mode of installation involving type approved licence plate manufacturers approved by States / UTs for old vehicles, the option of affixing HSRPs through



vehicle manufacturers is also available, which has been exercised by several States / UTs and has yielded positive results.

7. In view of the above, States / UTs are hereby advised to devise a plan to achieve 100% coverage of HSRPs in old vehicles also, i.e., those manufactured before 01.04.2019. Further, in case States / UTs are facing impediments in notifying authorized type approved licence plate manufacturers, appropriate steps may be taken to initiate the affixing of HSRPs through vehicle manufacturers and their dealers in an expeditious manner"

23. The latest Circular dated 08.01.2024, as noted above, is clarificatory in nature, and it does not in any manner violate Rule 50 of the 1989 Rules. This Court finds substance in the submission of the petitioners that in the notification dated 11.02.2020, whereby Rule 50 of the 1989 Rules were amended, the phrase '*provided they are approved by the State Government or Union Territory*' would mean authorised by the State Government or Union Territory, inasmuch as the HSRP manufacturer has already been approved if it holds the Type Approval Certificate from the competent agency. Approval for manufacturing is



not within the power or domain of the State Government but it is vested with the Central Government and its agencies. Once the Central Government or its agencies approve the HSRPs, and TAC is issued in favour of such an agency, no further approval is required from the State Government for affixing the number plates. However, the question is whether the State Government should allow all the entities having TACs to implement the HSRP Schemes with respect to the old vehicles in the States/Union Territories.

24. The State has the power to control the business of affixation, sale, and supply of HSRP on older vehicles, and the State should adopt a fair, transparent and justified procedure for choosing one or more license plate manufacturers and their dealers for implementation of the HSRP Scheme. This being a State subject of the Seventh Schedule of the Constitution of India, the State cannot be ousted to have no control over such business and I am of the considered view that such procedure for



choosing one or more license plate manufacturer and their dealers for affixing HSRP scheme on the older vehicles manufactured prior to 01.04.2019 would not be in any manner violative of Article 19(1)(g) of the Constitution of India.

25. The arguments advanced by the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners that the Advisory dated 09.06.2023 issued by the Central Government directing all State and Union Territories to take action against High-Security Registration Plate manufacturers fixing High-Security Registration Plates without authorisation from the State Government and the Advisory dated 08.01.2024 which clarifies that the State can implement the fixation of High-Security Registration Plates through the manufacturers and their dealers if the State is unable to authorize the licence place manufacturers are ultra vires the provisions of Rule 50 and Article 14, 19 and 21 of the Constitution of India, are to be rejected.



25.1 Rule 50(1)(v) of the 1989 Rules provides that the license plates with all specifications as provided in the Rules and specified registration for a vehicle shall be issued by the registering authority or approved licence plate manufacturers or their dealers. The approval/authorization of the State Government is for both, *i.e.*, the license plate manufacturers or their dealers. The two Circulars impugned, in no way, are *ultra vires* of Rule 50. Neither do they violate any of the fundamental rights guaranteed under the Constitution of India. Therefore, this Court does not find any substance in the submission of the learned Counsel for the petitioner that the Circulars dated 09.06.2023 and 08.01.2024 issued by the Central Government are *ultra vires* and, therefore, are liable to be set aside.

26. As noted above, the Supreme Court in its decisions reported in *Association of Registration Plates* (2005) 1 SCC 679; *Maninderjith Singh Bitta* (2011) 11 SCC 315; (2011) 14 SCC 273; (2012) 4 SCC 568 and (2016) 14



SCC 72 (supra) had held that merely on the basis of TAC one cannot be allowed to affix the HSRP unless approved by the State/Union Territory and directed the States to select approved HSRP manufacturer only through transparent tender process. The “*approval by the State Government or Union Territory*” would mean authorisation after selection. The approval is granted by the Central Government or its authorised agencies. Once a manufacturer has been given a license after approval to manufacturer HSRP and holds a valid license given after approval, no further approval from the State Government or Union Territory, as the case may be, is required. The relevant extract of the directions issued by the Supreme Court in the ***Association of Registration Plates*** (supra) has been extracted in paragraph 14.1 above.

26.1 A similar contention was raised by one of the members of the petitioners’ Association M/s. Yarya Sekur Pvt Ltd before the Madras High Court in W.P. No.4139/2021 and the said contention has been



rejected by the Madras High Court *vide* its Order dated 01.03.2021. The right to carry on any occupation, trade or business guaranteed under Article 19(1)(g) of the Constitution of India is not absolute and the State has the authority to make laws imposing reasonable restriction under Clause (6).

26.2 Having TAC is the eligibility condition for affixing the HSRP on the vehicles in the context of the HSRP scheme. But, merely on the basis of TAC, a person/entity would not automatically be entitled to conduct business related to the affixation or supply of HSRPs on the older vehicles unless such an entity is approved/authorized by the relevant State Government or Union Territory through a reasonable, just, fair and transparent selection process.

27. If the arguments of the petitioners are accepted that all entities having TAC should be allowed to affix the HSRP on the vehicles manufactured prior to 01.04.2019, and the State Government would not





have the power to authorize/approve by a transparent tender process, would lead to destroying the whole integrity of the HSRP system and intended security objectives and it would also be in violation of the directions issued by the Supreme Court inasmuch as the Supreme Court has directed that merely on the basis of having TAC, such a person cannot be allowed to affix the HSRP on the vehicles, as mentioned above. It would be open to potential misuse of the system and would be in violation of the directions issued by the Supreme Court in this regard.

27.1 The affixation of the HSRP is intended to ensure the safety and security of the vehicle and the public in general. If HSRP is issued without proper regulation and sold freely in the market, multiple plates could be issued for the same registration number. The security plates are to be affixed in a controlled and secure environment, ensuring security and uniqueness, which is the objective of the HSRP. Another aspect which is required to be noted is that in an uncontrolled market, fixing of



liability becomes challenging, and it would be difficult to hold manufacturers and dealers accountable for any discrepancy or misuse. In view thereof, the HSRP cannot be affixed without stringent control. Therefore, the submission of the petitioners cannot be accepted.

28. Another aspect which requires consideration is the Government notification dated 24.01.2024 wherein the State Government has assumed the responsibility for implementing the HSRP Scheme on vehicles manufactured prior to 01.04.2019. The notification issued by the State Government initially delegated the implementation of the HSRP Scheme to the Institute of Driver Training and Research (ITDR). However, the ITDR has declined and expressed its inability to implement the Scheme. Now the State Government states that the State Government itself will set up the plant and machinery for manufacturing the HSRP for which the tenders have been invited. The Government does not have the necessary expertise, experience and technical know-how in



the absence of TAC to effectively implement the HSRP Scheme.

29. This Court fails to understand the stand of the State Government, where almost all States are implementing the HSRP Scheme by inviting tenders and selecting one or more HSRP vendors who have the requisite qualifications for fixing the HSRP on old vehicles, the State Government itself wants to do the business. The Government has issued another notification G.O. (Rt) No.285/2024/Trans dated 30.07.2024. It appears that the State Government is not interested in implementing the HSRP scheme on the old vehicles by selecting one or more approved license plate manufacturers or its dealers having TAC by an open, transparent and fair tendering process.

29.1 The notification dated 30.07.2024 issued by the State Government is extracted hereunder:

“ TRANSPORT (B) DEPARTMENT  
G.O.(Rt)No.285/2024/Trans Dated, Thiruvananthapuram, 30.07.2024  
Read 1. G.O.(P) No.2/2021/SPD dated 17.03.2021  
2. G.O.(P) No.6/2021/SPD dated 25.11.2021



3. G.O.(Rt) No.39/2024/Trans dated 24.01.2024

As per the G.O. read 3 above, Government have authorised the Registering Authority for issuance of HSRP in existing old registered vehicles prior to 01/04/2019 in the State in accordance with the conditions stipulated in Rule 50 CMVR and Motor Vehicle (HSRP) Rules 2018. The Institute of Driver Training and Research (IDTR) was entrusted to provide technical and infrastructural support.

2. The Transport Commissioner invited bid for the establishment of a plant for manufacturing of HSRP with in the IDTR, Edappal premises.

3. Since IDTR, is intended to impart trainings, the Governing body met on 22.07.2024, decided to abstain the institute from providing the required support for HSRP.

4. Government have examined the matter in detail. Considering the fact that a transparent and fair process in the procurement is necessary and the best quality of machinery to be ensured, the Registering Authority is hereby directed to float global tender. The Registering Authority shall act according to the norms prescribed in the Store Purchase Manual and the GOs' read as 1&2. The Technical and infrastructural support of IDTR mandated in the GO read 3 above is cancelled and the GO stands modified to that extent.”

29.2 The notification dated 30.07.2024, issued by the State



Government, provides that all 85 Regional Transport Officers (RTOs) in Kerala would be open to float global tenders for purchasing machinery to set up a plant and obtain TAC. This Court fails to understand the underlying intent of the State Government for such a notification. This notification is nothing but a devise not to implement the HSRP Scheme in the State of Kerala. Therefore, the said notification, which is in the teeth of the Supreme Court direction, is hereby set aside and quashed.

29.3 The HSRP Scheme was introduced to enhance the security and identification of motor vehicles through standardised registration plates. In various judgments, the Supreme Court and several High Courts have held the mandatory nature of the Scheme, which is critical in promoting road safety and vehicle-related offences.

29.4 In *Maninderjith Singh Bitta* (2012) 4 SCC 568 held that the installation of HSRP is a statutory command which is not only in the interest of the security of the State but also serves a much larger public



interest. Therefore, it is not only desirable but mandatory for every State to comply with the statutory provisions/orders of the Supreme Court in terms of Article 129 of the Constitution of India. All States, therefore, are mandated to fully implement fixing of HSRP in their entire State, positively by 30.04.2012 in relation to the new vehicles and 15.06.2012 for old vehicles and no further extension of time for implementing the order would be allowed. Paragraph 17 of the said judgment would read as follows:

“17. Having perused the report of the Registrar and the affidavits filed on behalf of different States, we issue the following directions:

(a) All States which have invited tenders, have completed the process of finalising the successful bidder and issued the letter of intent but have not yet signed agreements with the successful bidder shall sign such agreements within four weeks from today. These States are Assam, Bihar, Gujarat, Haryana, Jammu and Kashmir, Jharkhand, Punjab, Tripura and Uttar Pradesh.

(b) The States which have so far not even finalised the tender process, they should do so, again, within four weeks from today. Amongst others these States and Union Territories are Chhattisgarh, Madhya Pradesh,



Chandigarh, Delhi (NCT) and Puducherry.

(c) Installation of HSRP is a statutory command which is not only in the interest of the security of State, but also serves a much larger public interest. Therefore, it is not only desirable, but mandatory, for every State to comply with the statutory provisions/orders of this Court in terms of Article 129 of the Constitution of India, 1950. All States, therefore, are mandated to fully implement the Scheme of fixation of HSRP in their entire State, positively by 30-4-2012 in relation to new vehicles and 15-6-2012 for old vehicles. We make it clear that they shall not be allowed any further extension of time for implementation of this direction.

(d) The directions contained in the earlier judgments of this Court and more particularly, the orders dated 30-8-20115, 13-10-20116, 8-12- 20117 and this order, should be implemented within the extended period without default.

(e) In the event of default, Secretary (Transport)/Commissioner, State Transport Authority and/or any other person or authority concerned responsible for such default shall be liable to be proceeded against under the provisions of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.”

In ***Maninderjith Singh Bitta*** (2016) 14 SCC 72 (supra), the Court held that it is the responsibility of the Central and State Governments to implement the HSRP Scheme validly as per the technical and security standards laid down by the law.



29.5 In *M/s Real Mazon India Ltd v. State of Punjab*<sup>11</sup> the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh held that the HSRP Scheme is mandatory for all motor vehicles in India.

30. As the State Government has not invited tenders to select one or more license plate manufacturers having the requisite qualification for affixing the HSRP on the vehicles manufactured prior to 01.04.2019, this Court is of the considered view that till the Government undertakes an open, fair, and transparent tender process for selecting one or more license plate manufacturers and their dealers for affixing HSRPs on vehicles manufactured prior to 01.04.2019, the OEM should be allowed to affix the number plates on the old vehicles by their dealers as is done in several other States such as West Bengal, Rajasthan, Karnataka, Gujarat, Assam, Madhya Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, Sikkim, Bihar, Odisha, Andaman and Nicobar, Himachal Pradesh, NCT Delhi, Uttar Pradesh.

---

<sup>11</sup> 2017 SCC Online P&H 2868





31. Thus, the present writ petitions, are disposed of on the following terms:

- (i) So far as the prayer for allowing the license plate manufacturers and their dealers, having a Type Approval Certificate issued by the central agency, to affix HSRP without any further approval/selection by the State Government, is rejected.
- (ii) The Advisory/Letter No.Rt-11036/99/2020-MVL dated 09.06.2023 issued by the Central Government is upheld.
- (iii) Advisory/Letter No. RT-11036/99/2020-MVL dated 08.01.2024 issued by the Central Government is upheld.
- (iv) The notification G.O.(Rt) No.285/2024/Trans dated 30.07.2024 is set aside.
- (v) The Original Equipment Manufacturers and their dealers are permitted to affix the HSRP on old vehicles manufactured prior to 01.04.2019 till the Government takes the necessary steps to



select/approve/authorise one or more licence plate manufacturers/their dealers for affixing HSRP on the old vehicles by carrying out the selection/authorization process by an open, transparent, and fair tendering process.

All Interlocutory Applications regarding interim matters stand closed.

Sd/-

**D K SINGH**

JUDGE



APPENDIX OF WP(C) 7089/2023

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

- Exhibit P1 TRUE COPY OF THE TYPE APPROVAL CERTIFICATE ISSUED TO THE PETITIONER BY INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY, MANESAR
- Exhibit P2 TRUE COPY OF THE RELEVANT PAGES OF THE GAZETTE NOTIFICATION G.S.R. NO. 104(E) DATED 11.02.2020 ISSUED BY THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
- Exhibit P3 TRUE COPY OF THE RELEVANT PAGES OF THE GAZETTE NOTIFICATION G.S.R. NO. 640 (E) DATED 18.08.2022 ISSUED BY THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
- Exhibit P4 TRUE COPY OF A CHALLAN ISSUED BY THE ASSISTANT MOTOR VEHICLES INSPECTOR DATED 31.08.2022 WITH RESPECT TO A MOTOR VEHICLE BEARING REGISTRATION NUMBER KL-41-M-8800
- Exhibit P5 TRUE COPY OF A CHALLAN ISSUED BY THE ASSISTANT MOTOR VEHICLES INSPECTOR DATED 24.10.2022 WITH RESPECT TO MOTOR VEHICLE BEARING REGISTRATION NUMBER KL-25-E-8832
- Exhibit P6 TRUE COPY OF THE SCREENSHOT TAKEN FROM THE WEBSITE: WWW.PARIVAHAN.GOV.IN
- Exhibit P7 THE TRUE COPY OF A SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENT EXECUTED BY THE PETITIONER WITH ONE OF ITS SERVICE PARTNERS DATED 05.10.2022
- Exhibit P8 TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE ISSUED TO A SERVICE PARTNER OF THE PETITIONER BY THE NSDC DATED 27.10.2022
- Exhibit P9 TRUE COPY OF THE INVOICE BEARING NO.R8/2223/350 ISSUED BY THE PETITIONER DATED 14.02.2023
- Exhibit P10 TRUE COPY OF THE INVOICE BEARING NO.R56/2223/96 ISSUED BY THE PETITIONER DATED 14.02.2023
- Exhibit P11 THE TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER ISSUED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA DATED 16.06.2016



- Exhibit P12 THE TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER ISSUED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA DATED 02.08.2016
- Exhibit P13 THE TRUE COPY OF THE INVOICE ISSUED TO THE PETITIONER BY INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY DATED 29.04.2019
- Exhibit P14 THE TRUE COPY OF THE INVOICE ISSUED TO THE PETITIONER BY INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY DATED 14.05.2019
- Exhibit P15 THE TRUE COPY OF THE INVOICE ISSUED TO THE PETITIONER BY INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY DATED 22.03.2021
- Exhibit P16 THE TRUE COPY OF THE INVOICE ISSUED TO THE PETITIONER BY INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY DATED 16.03.2022
- Exhibit P17 THE TRUE COPY OF THE INVOICE ISSUED TO THE PETITIONER BY INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY DATED 18.04.2022
- RESPONDENT EXHIBITS
- Exhibit R4(A) TRUE COPY OF BOARD RESOLUTION SHOWING AND EMPOWERING DEPONENT DATED 12.04.2023
- Exhibit R4(B) TRUE COPY OF CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION OF THE APPLICANT UNDER SOCIETIES REGISTRATION ACT XXI OF 1860
- Exhibit R5(a)
- Exhibit R5 (a) TRUE COPY OF THE TYPE APPROVAL CERTIFICATE ISSUED TO THE PETITIONER BY INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY, MANESAR
- Exhibit R5 (b) TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE FOR CONFORMITY OF PRODUCTION ISSUED TO THE PETITIONER BY INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY, MANESAR



PETITIONER EXHIBITS

- Exhibit P18 THE TRUE COPY OF THE MOTOR VEHICLE (NEW HIGH SECURITY REGISTRATION PLATES), ORDER 2001
- Exhibit P19 THE TRUE COPY OF RULE 50 OF CENTRAL MOTOR VEHICLES RULES, 1989 AS EXISTING IN THE YEAR 2001
- Exhibit P20 THE TRUE COPY OF THE MOTOR VEHICLES (HIGH SECURITY REGISTRATION PLATES) ORDER, 2018
- Exhibit P21 THE TRUE COPY OF THE AIS:037:2004
- Exhibit P22 THE TRUE COPY OF THE AIS:159:2019
- Exhibit P23 THE TRUE COPY OF THE TABLE SHOWING THE HIGH SECURITY REGISTRATION PLATES SUPPLIED BY HSRP VENDORS AS OBTAINED FROM THE VAHAAN PORTAL

RESPONDENT EXHIBITS

- Exhibit R3(a) A true copy of the advisory issued by the Ministry of Road, Transport and Highways dated 8th January,2024



APPENDIX OF WP(C) 18049/2023

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

- Exhibit-P1 TRUE COPY OF THE TYPE APPROVAL CERTIFICATE ISSUED TO THE PETITIONER BY INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY, MANESAR
- Exhibit-P2 TRUE COPY OF THE RELEVANT PAGES OF THE GAZETTE NOTIFICATION G.S.R. NO. 104(E) DATED 11.02.2020 ISSUED BY THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
- Exhibit-P3 TRUE COPY OF THE RELEVANT PAGES OF THE GAZETTE NOTIFICATION G.S.R. NO. 640 (E) DATED 18.08.2022 ISSUED BY THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
- Exhibit-P4 TRUE COPY OF A CHALLAN ISSUED BY THE ASSISTANT MOTOR VEHICLES INSPECTOR DATED 31.08.2022 WITH RESPECT TO A MOTOR VEHICLE BEARING REGISTRATION NUMBER KL-41-M-8800
- Exhibit-P5 TRUE COPY OF A CHALLAN ISSUED BY THE ASSISTANT MOTOR VEHICLES INSPECTOR DATED 24.10.2022 WITH RESPECT TO MOTOR VEHICLE BEARING REGISTRATION NUMBER KL-25-E-8832
- Exhibit-P6 TRUE COPY OF THE SCREENSHOT TAKEN FROM THE WEBSITE: WWW.PARIVAHAN.GOV.IN
- Exhibit-P7 THE TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER PASSED IN WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO.10761/2022 DATED 13.04.2023
- Exhibit-P8 THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER PASSED IN WRIT APPEAL NO.999/2023 DATED 29.03.2023
- Exhibit-P9 THE TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.1 DATED 16.06.2016
- Exhibit-P10 THE TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.1 DATED 02.08.2016
- Exhibit-P11 THE TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.1 DATED 06.09.2021



- Exhibit-P12 THE TRUE COPY OF THE INVOICE ISSUED TO THE PETITIONER BY INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY
- RESPONDENT EXHIBITS
- Exhibit R4(A) A TRUE COPY OF BOARD RESOLUTION SHOWING AND EMPOWERING APPLICANT WITH RESPECT OF THE SAME
- Exhibit R4(B) THE TRUE COPY OF THE I.A NO 5 OF 2023 IN WRIT PETITION NO 10761/2022 WHICH WAS ALLOWED BY THIS HON'BLE COURT VIDE ORDER DATED 4.07.2023
- Exhibit R4(C) A COPY OF REGISTRATION CERTIFICATE OF THE APPLICANT DATED 13.03.2002
- Exhibit R4(D) A COPY OF THE JUDGMENT OF THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT IN ASSN. OF REGISTARTION PLATES V UNION OF INDIA (2005) 1 SCC 679
- Exhibit R4(E) THE COPY OF ORDER IN MANINDERJITH SINGH BITTA V UNION OF INDIA (2008) 7 SCC 328
- Exhibit R4(F) THE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT OF THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT IN MANINDERJIT SINGH BITTA VS. UNION OF INDIA & ORS 2011 14 SCC 273
- Exhibit R4(G) THE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT OF THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT IN MANINDERJITH SINGH BITTA VS UNION OF INDIA 2012(1) SCC 707
- Exhibit R4(H) THE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT OF THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT IN MANINDERJITH SINGH BITTA VS UNION OF INDIA 2012(4) SCC 568
- Exhibit R4(I) A COPY OF THE JUDGMENT OF THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT IN MANINDERJITH SINGH BITTA VS VIJAY CHHIBBER (2016) 14 SCC 72
- Exhibit R4(J) A COPY OF THE ORDER OF THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT IN M C MEHTA VS. UNION OF INDIA & ORS. DATED 10.12.2018
- Exhibit R4(K) A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT DATED 8.11.2019 FILED BY MORTH BEFORE THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT WITH ANNEXURES IN W.P.(C) 13029 OF 1985.



- Exhibit R4 (L) A TRUE COPY OF ADVISORY DATED 16.09.2020
- Exhibit R4(M) THE COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT DATED 21.11.2019 (WITH ANNEXURES )  
IN W.P.(C). 13029 OF 1985.
- Exhibit R4(N) A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF W.P.(C) 13029 OF 1985 DATED  
23.10.2019 ( WITH ANNEXURES)
- Exhibit R4(O) A COPY OF THE ORDER PASSED BY THE STATE OF HIMACHAL  
PRADESH DATED 16.04.2020
- Exhibit R4(P) A COPY OF THE CIRCULAR DATED 26.05.2022 ISSUED BY THE STATE OF  
UTTARAKAHAND , PRODUCED ALONG WITH ENGLISH TRANSLATION
- Exhibit R4(Q) A TRUE COPY OF THE CIRCULAR DATED 26.05.2022 ISSUED BY THE  
STATE OF BIHAR, PRODUCED ALONG WITH ENGLISH TRANSLATION
- Exhibit R4(R) THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER IN WRIT PETITION FILED ORBIZ  
AUTOMOTIVEZ BEFORE THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA DATED  
19.04.2023
- Exhibit R4(S) THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER OF HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT  
BANGALURU IN MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION OF INDIA & ORS VS.  
STATE OF KARNATAKA & ORS. DATED 20.09.2023
- Exhibit R4(T) THR TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 25.10.2023
- Exhibit R4(U) COPY OF THE PROCEDURE FOLLOWED BY VEHICLE MANUFACTURERS  
FOR SELECTING THE SUITABLE HSRP SUPPLIERS





APPENDIX OF WP(C) 22207/2023

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

- |             |   |
|-------------|---|
| Exhibit-P1  | THE TRUE COPY OF THE MOTOR VEHICLE (NEW HIGH SECURITY REGISTRATION PLATES), ORDER 2001  |
| Exhibit-P2  | THE TRUE COPY OF G.S.R. 1162(E) ISSUED BY RESPONDENT NO.1 DATED 04.12.2018  |
| Exhibit-P3  | THE TRUE COPY OF THE MOTOR VEHICLES (HIGH SECURITY REGISTRATION PLATES) ORDER, 2018   |
| Exhibit-P4  | THE TRUE COPY OF THE NOTIFICATION G.S.R. 104(E) DATED 11.02.2020 ISSUED BY RESPONDENT NO.1  |
| Exhibit-P5  | THE TRUE COPY OF THE NOTIFICATION G.S.R. 640(E) DATED 18.08.2022 ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.1  |
| Exhibit-P6  | TRUE COPY OF THE TYPE APPROVAL CERTIFICATE ISSUED TO THE PETITIONER BY INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY, MANESAR                                    |
| Exhibit-P7  | TRUE COPY OF A CHALLAN ISSUED BY THE ASSISTANT MOTOR VEHICLES INSPECTOR DATED 31.08.2022 WITH RESPECT TO A MOTOR VEHICLE BEARING REGISTRATION NUMBER KL-41-M-8800 |
| Exhibit-P8  | TRUE COPY OF A CHALLAN ISSUED BY THE ASSISTANT MOTOR VEHICLES INSPECTOR DATED 24.10.2022 WITH RESPECT TO MOTOR VEHICLE BEARING REGISTRATION NUMBER KL-25-E-8832   |
| Exhibit-P9  | TRUE COPY OF THE SCREENSHOT TAKEN FROM THE WEBSITE: WWW.PARIVAHAN.GOV.IN  |
| Exhibit-P10 | THE TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER PASSED IN WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO.10761/2022 DATED 13.04.2023   |
| Exhibit-P11 | THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER PASSED IN WRIT APPEAL NO.999/2023 DATED 29.05.2023   |



- Exhibit-P12 THE TRUE COPY OF THE ADVISORY / LETTER ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.1 DATED 09.06.2023
- Exhibit-P13 THE TRUE COPY OF THE TABLE SHOWING THE HIGH SECURITY REGISTRATION PLATES SUPPLIED BY HSRP VENDORS AS OBTAINED FROM THE VAHAAN PORTAL
- Exhibit-P14 THE TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.1 DATED 16.06.2016
- Exhibit-P15 THE TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.1 DATED 02.08.2016
- Exhibit-P16 THE TRUE COPY COPY OF THE LETTER ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.1 DATED 10.02.2017
- Exhibit-P17 THE TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.1 DATED 06.09.2021

RESPONDENT EXHIBITS

- Exhibit R4(a) A TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION OF THE IMPLEADING PETITIONER IS ANNEXED

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

- Exhibit P18 THE TRUE COPY OF THE NOTICE ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.3 WITH ENCLOSURE

RESPONDENT EXHIBITS

- Exhibit R2(a) True copy of the order G.O(Rt) No.39/2024/TRANS dated 24.01.2024 by Transport(B) Department
- Exhibit R2(b) True copy of the order G.O(Rt) No.285/2024/TRANS dated 30.07.2024 of Transport(B) Department



APPENDIX OF WP(C) 29866/2023

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

- Exhibit -P1 THE TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION ISSUED TO THE PETITIONER DATED 19.07.2023 ALONG WITH ENGLISH TRANSLATION
- Exhibit -P2 THE TRUE COPY OF THE MOTOR VEHICLE (NEW HIGH SECURITY REGISTRATION PLATES), ORDER 2001
- Exhibit -P3 THE TRUE COPY OF G.S.R. 1162(E) ISSUED BY RESPONDENT NO.1 DATED 04.12.2018
- Exhibit -P4 THE TRUE COPY OF THE MOTOR VEHICLES (HIGH SECURITY REGISTRATION PLATES) ORDER, 2018
- Exhibit -P5 THE TRUE COPY OF THE NOTIFICATION G.S.R. 104(E) DATED 11.02.2020 ISSUED BY RESPONDENT NO.1
- Exhibit -P6 THE TRUE COPY OF THE NOTIFICATION G.S.R. 640(E) DATED 18.08.2022 ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.1
- Exhibit -P7 TRUE COPY OF THE TYPE APPROVAL CERTIFICATE ISSUED TO A MEMBER OF THE PETITIONER ASSOCIATION
- Exhibit -P8 TRUE COPY OF A CHALLAN ISSUED BY THE ASSISTANT MOTOR VEHICLES INSPECTOR DATED 31.08.2022 WITH RESPECT TO A MOTOR VEHICLE BEARING REGISTRATION NUMBER KL-41-M-8800
- Exhibit -P9 TRUE COPY OF A CHALLAN ISSUED BY THE ASSISTANT MOTOR VEHICLES INSPECTOR DATED 24.10.2022 WITH RESPECT TO MOTOR VEHICLE BEARING REGISTRATION NUMBER KL-25-E-8832
- Exhibit -P10 TRUE COPY OF THE SCREENSHOT TAKEN FROM THE WEBSITE: WWW.PARIVAHAN.GOV.IN
- Exhibit-P11 THE TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER PASSED IN WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO.10761/2022 DATED 13.04.2023



- Exhibit -P12 THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER PASSED IN WRIT APPEAL NO.999/2023 DATED 29.05.2023
- Exhibit-P13 THE TRUE COPY OF THE ADVISORY / LETTER ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.1 DATED 09.06.2023
- Exhibit -P14 THE TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.3 DATED 16.08.2023
- Exhibit-P 15 THE TRUE COPY OF THE TABLE SHOWING THE HIGH SECURITY REGISTRATION PLATES SUPPLIED BY HSRP VENDORS AS OBTAINED FROM THE VAHAAN PORTAL
- Exhibit -P16 THE TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.1 DATED 16.06.2016
- Exhibit -P17 THE TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.1 DATED 02.08.2016
- Exhibit-P 18 THE TRUE COPY COPY OF THE LETTER ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.1 DATED 10.02.2017
- Exhibit -P19 THE TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.1 DATED 06.09.2021
- RESPONDENT EXHIBITS
- Exhibit R4(A) A TRUE COPY OF BOARD RESOLUTION SHOWING AND EMPOWERING ME WITH RESPECT OF THE SAME
- Exhibit R4(B) - THE TRUE COPY OF THE I.A NO 5 OF 2023 IN WRIT PETITION NO 10761/2022 WHICH WAS ALLOWED BY THIS HON'BLE COURT VIDE ORDER DATED 4.07.2023
- Exhibit R4(C) A COPY OF REGISTRATION CERTIFICATE OF THE APPLICANT DATED 13.03.2002
- Exhibit R4(D) - A COPY OF THE JUDGMENT OF THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT IN ASSN. OF REGISTARTION PLATES V UNION OF INDIA (2005) 1 SCC 679
- Exhibit R4(E) THE COPY OF ORDER IN MANINDERJITH SINGH BITTA V UNION OF



INDIA (2008) 7 SCC 328

- Exhibit R4(F) - THE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT OF THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT IN MANINDERJIT SINGH BITTA VS. UNION OF INDIA & ORS 2011 14 SCC 273
- Exhibit R4(G) THE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT OF THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT IN MANINDERJITH SINGH BITTA VS UNION OF INDIA 2012(1) SCC 707
- Exhibit R4(H) THE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT OF THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT IN MANINDERJITH SINGH BITTA VS UNION OF INDIA 2012(4) SCC 568
- Exhibit R4(I) A COPY OF THE JUDGMENT OF THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT IN MANINDERJITH SINGH BITTA VS VIJAY CHHIBBER (2016) 14 SCC 72
- Exhibit R4(J) A COPY OF THE ORDER OF THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT IN M C MEHTA VS. UNION OF INDIA & ORS. DATED 10.12.2018
- Exhibit R4(K) A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT DATED 8.11.2019 FILED BY MORTH BEFORE THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT WITH ANNEXURES IN W.P.(C) 13029 OF 1985.
- Exhibit R4(L) A TRUE COPY OF ADVISORY DATED 16.09.2020
- Exhibit R4(M) THE COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT DATED 21.11.2019 (WITH ANNEXURES ) IN W.P.(C). 13029 OF 1985
- Exhibit R4(N) - A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF W.P.(C) 13029 OF 1985 DATED 23.10.2019 ( WITH ANNEXURES)
- Exhibit R4(O) A COPY OF THE ORDER PASSED BY THE STATE OF HIMACHAL PRADESH DATED 16.04.2020
- Exhibit R4(P) - A COPY OF THE CIRCULAR DATED 26.05.2022 ISSUED BY THE STATE OF UTTARAKHAND , PRODUCED ALONG WITH ENGLISH TRANSLATION
- Exhibit R4(Q) A TRUE COPY OF THE CIRCULAR DATED 26.05.2022 ISSUED BY THE STATE OF BIHAR, PRODUCED ALONG WITH ENGLISH TRANSLATION
- Exhibit R4(R) - THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER IN WRIT PETITION FILED ORBIZ



AUTOMOTIVEZ BEFORE THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA DATED  
19.04.2023

- Exhibit R4(S) - THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER OF HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BANGALURU IN MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION OF INDIA & ORS VS. STATE OF KARNATAKA & ORS. DATED 20.09.2023
- Exhibit R4(T) THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 25.10.2023
- Exhibit R4(U) COPY OF THE PROCEDURE FOLLOWED BY VEHICLE MANUFACTURERS FOR SELECTING THE SUITABLE HSRP SUPPLIERS

RESPONDENT EXHIBITS

- Exhibit R1A True copy of the advisory dated 8.1.2024 issued by the Ministry of Road Transport and Highways, Government of India.

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

- Exhibit P20 THE TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER PASSED IN WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO.29866/2023 DATED 27.11.2023
- Exhibit P21 THE TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER PASSED IN WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO.29866/2023 DATED 08.12.2023
- Exhibit P22 THE TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER PASSED IN WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO.29866/2023 DATED 09.01.2024
- Exhibit P23 THE TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER PASSED IN WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO.29866/2023 DATED 30.01.2024
- Exhibit P24 THE TRUE COPY OF THE INVOICE ISSUED BY THE DEALER OF A VEHICLE MANUFACTURER DATED 24.01.2024 FOR A VEHICLE BEARING REGISTRATION NO. KL-07-CN-1188
- Exhibit P25 THE TRUE COPY OF THE CLARIFICATION ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.1 DATED 08.01.2024



APPENDIX OF WP(C) 14467/2024

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

- |             |  |
|-------------|--|
| Exhibit P1  | THE TRUE COPY OF THE REGISTRATION CERTIFICATE ISSUED TO THE PETITIONER   |
| Exhibit P2  | THE TRUE COPY OF THE MOTOR VEHICLE (NEW HIGH SECURITY REGISTRATION PLATES), ORDER 2001   |
| Exhibit P3  | THE TRUE COPY OF G.S.R. 1162(E) ISSUED BY RESPONDENT NO.1 DATED 04.12.2018   |
| Exhibit P4  | THE TRUE COPY OF THE MOTOR VEHICLES (HIGH SECURITY REGISTRATION PLATES) ORDER, 2018  |
| Exhibit P5  | THE TRUE COPY OF THE NOTIFICATION G.S.R. 104(E) DATED 11.02.2020 ISSUED BY RESPONDENT NO.1                                     |
| Exhibit P6  | THE TRUE COPY OF THE NOTIFICATION G.S.R. 640(E) DATED 18.08.2022 ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.1                                 |
| Exhibit P7  | TRUE COPY OF THE TYPE APPROVAL CERTIFICATE ISSUED TO THE PETITIONER BY INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY, MANESAR |
| Exhibit P8  | TRUE COPY OF THE SCREENSHOT TAKEN FROM THE WEBSITE: WWW.PARIVAHAN.GOV.IN   |
| Exhibit P9  | THE TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER PASSED IN WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO.10761/2022 DATED 13.04.2023                              |
| Exhibit 10  | THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER PASSED IN WRIT APPEAL NO.999/2023 DATED 29.05.2023  |
| Exhibit P11 | THE TRUE COPY OF THE ADVISORY / LETTER ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.1 DATED 09.06.2023  |
| Exhibit P12 | THE TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.3 DATED 16.08.2023   |



- Exhibit P13 THE TRUE COPY OF THE TABLE SHOWING THE HIGH SECURITY REGISTRATION PLATES SUPPLIED BY HSRP VENDORS AS OBTAINED FROM THE VAHAAN PORTAL
- Exhibit P14 THE TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.1 DATED 16.06.2016
- Exhibit P15 THE TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.1 DATED 02.08.2016
- Exhibit P16 THE TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.1 DATED 10.02.2017
- Exhibit P17 THE TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.1 DATED 06.09.2021
- Exhibit P18 THE TRUE COPY OF ORDER OF THIS HON'BLE COURT DATED 27.11.2023 IN W.P.(C) NO.29866/2023
- Exhibit P19 THE TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER PASSED BY THIS HON'BLE COURT DATED 08.12.2023 IN W.P.(C) NO.29866/2023
- Exhibit P20 THE TRUE COPY OF THE ADVISORY ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT DATED 08.01.2024
- Exhibit P21 THE TRUE COPY INTERIM ORDER OF THIS HON'BLE COURT DATED 09.01.2024 IN W.P.(C) NO.29866/2023
- Exhibit P22 THE TRUE COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT FILED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT DATED 29.01.2024 IN W.P.(C) NO.10761/2022
- Exhibit P23 THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT NUMBERED AS G.O. (RT) NO. 39/2024/TRANS DATED 24.01.2024
- Exhibit P24 THE TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER PASSED BY THIS HON'BLE COURT DATED 30.01.2024 IN W.P.(C) NO.29866/2023
- RESPONDENT ANNEXURES
- Annexure A1 A TRUE COPY OF THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL DATED 23.02.2024



WP(C) NOS. 10761 OF 2022, 7089 OF 2023, 18049 OF 2023,  
22207 OF 2023, 29866 OF 2023, 14467 OF 2024



97

2024:KER:90019

ISSUED BY IDTR

RESPONDENT EXHIBITS

Exhibit R2(a)

A true copy of the Government Order G.O(Rt) No. 285/2024/TRANS  
dated 30-07-2024.



APPENDIX OF WP(C) 10761/2022

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

- Exhibit P1 TRUE COPY OF LICENSE IN THE FORM OF TYPE APPROVAL CERTIFICATE NO. GK0043 DATED 15.10.2019 ISSUED TO THE PETITIONER.
- Exhibit P1(A) TRUE COPY OF LICENSE IN THE FORM OF TYPE APPROVAL CERTIFICATE NO GK0044 DATED 15.10.2019 ISSUED TO THE PETITIONER.
- Exhibit P2 TRUE COPY OF NOTIFICATION NO G.S.R 1162 (E) DATED 04.12.2018 ISSUED BY THE MINISTRY OF ROAD TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS.
- Exhibit P3 TRUE COPY OF NOTIFICATION NO. S.O. 6052 (E) DATED 06.12.2018 ISSUED BY THE MINISTRY OF ROAD TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS.
- Exhibit P4 TRUE COPY OF NOTIFICATION NO. GSR 104 (E) DATED 11.02.2020 ISSUED BY THE MINISTRY OF ROAD TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS
- Exhibit P5 TRUE COPY OF THE PHOTOGRAPHS, SHOWING VEHICLES WITH HSRP NOT COMPLYING TO RULE 51 OF CMVR 1989 AND NOT COMPLYING TO RULE 51 OF CMVR 1989 AND NOT IN COMPLIANCE WITH AND CONFORMANCE TO THE TYPE APPROVAL CERTIFICATE ISSUED THAT ARE ILLEGAL.
- Exhibit P6 TRUE COPY OF PAGES RELATING TO HSRP AS THEY APPEAR IN THE FACEBOOK PAGE OF THE KERALA MOTOR VEHICLE DEPARTMENT.
- Exhibit P7 TRUE COPY OF COMMUNICATION F. NO. RT 11036/56/2019- MVL DATED 01.09.2021 SENT BY THE MINISTRY OF ROAD TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS TO THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARIES/ SECRETARIES, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT COMMISSIONERS OF ALL STATES AND UNION TERRITORIES.
- Exhibit P8 TRUE COPY OF CIRCULAR NO. B2/125/2019 /TRANS. DATED 09.05.2019 ISSUED BY THE TRANSPORT (B) DEPARTMENT, GOVERNMENT OF KERALA.
- Exhibit P9 TRUE COPY OF REPRESENTATION DATED 18.02.2020 SUBMITTED BY



THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE TRANSPORT COMMISSIONER, KERALA,  
THIRUVNANTHAPURAM.

- Exhibit P10 TRUE COPY OF REPRESENTATION DATED 01.11.2021 SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE TRANSPORT COMMISSIONER, KERALA, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM WITH RELEVANT DETAILS.
- Exhibit P11 TRUE COPY OF REPRESENTATION DATED 07.02.2022 ALONG WITH RELEVANT DETAILS SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE SHRI. AJITH KUMAR, IPS , TRANSPORT COMMISSIONER, KERALA, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
- Exhibit P12 TRUE COPY OF COMMUNICATION NO.MIT2/23/2022-TC DATED 20.07.2022 SENT BY THE TRANSPORT COMMISSIONER TO THE PETITIONER.
- Exhibit P12(B) TRUE COPY OF NOTIFICATION NO. S.O. 814(E) DATED 22-08-2001 CALLED THE MOTOR VEHICLES (NEW HIGH SECURITY REGISTRATION PLATES) ORDER OF 2001 OF MINISTRY OF ROAD TRANSPORTS AND HIGHWAYS.
- Exhibit P12(B) TRUE COPY OF NOTIFICATION NO. S.O. 1041(E) DATED 16-10-2001 OF MINISTRY OF ROAD TRANSPORTS AND HIGHWAYS.
- Exhibit P13 TRUE COPY OF COMMUNICATION BEARING FILE NO. MIT2/23/2022-TC FROM THE THIRD RESPONDENT BY THE PETITIONER.
- Exhibit P14 TRUE COPY OF TENDER CANCELLATION NOTICE R.NO.33432/HB2/2019 DATED 01-04-2022 ISSUED BY THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU.
- Exhibit P15 TRUE COPY OF G.S.R. 640(E) DATED 18TH AUGUST 2022 MINISTRY OF ROAD TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS.
- Exhibit P16 TRUE COPY OF NEWS ITEM APPEARED IN THE WEBSITE OF THE ECONOMIC TIMES DAILY DATED 14-06-2022.
- Exhibit P17 TRUE COPY OF LETTER NO. RT-11021/47/2014-MVL DATED 01-10-2018 ISSUED BY THE MINISTRY OF ROAD TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS.
- Exhibit P18 TRUE COPY OF RELEVANT PAGES OF THE EPCA REPORT NO.103 DATED 25-09-2019.



- Exhibit P19 TRUE COPY OF MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 24.09.2019 UNDER THE CHAIRMANSHIP OF JOINT SECRETARY (MVL), MINISTRY OF ROAD TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS TRANSPORT COMMISSIONER.
- Exhibit P20 TRUE COPY OF COMMUNICATION BEARING RT-11036/56/2019-MVL DATED 21.10.2020 HAS BEEN ISSUED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA, MINISTRY OF ROAD TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS ON THE SUBJECT OF REPLACEMENT OF HIGH SECURITY REGISTRATION PLATE
- Exhibit P21 TRUE COPY OF COMMUNICATION BEARING NOS. RT-11017/13/2005-MVL DATED 16.0.2016 ISSUED BY THE MINISTRY OF ROAD TRANSPORT & HIGHWAYS, GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
- Exhibit P22 TRUE COPY OF THE COMMUNICATION NO.RT-11017/13/2005-MVL DATED 02/08/2016 ISSUED BY THE MINISTRY OF ROAD TRANSPORT & HIGHWAYS, GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
- Exhibit P23 TRUE COPY OF COMMUNICATION D.O.RT-11028/3/2000-MVL(PT) DATED 14.12.2001 ISSUED BY THE MINISTRY OF ROAD TRANSPORT & HIGHWAYS, GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
- RESPONDENT EXHIBITS
- Exhibit R2(a) True copy of G.S.R 640(E) dated 18.08.2022
- Exhibit R2(c) A true copy of the guidelines of the Ministry of Road Transport and Highways regarding the High Security Registration plate
- Exhibit R2(b) True copy of the Advisory letter of Ministry of Road Transport and Highways(MoRTH) to all States dated 01.09.2021
- PETITIONER EXHIBITS
- EXHIBIT P24 TRUE COPY OF CIRCULAR NO. C2/9549/TC/2010 DATED 17..12..2010 ISSUED BY THE THIRD RESPONDENT
- EXHIBIT P25 COMMUNICATION NO. RT-11036/19/2021-MVL DATED 06..09..2021 OF THE MINISTRY OF ROAD TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS, NEW DELHI
- EXHIBIT P26 TRUE COPY OF ORDER R.NO. 14731/HB2/2020 DATED 11..08..2022



EXHIBIT P27 TRUE EXTRACT OF RELEVANT PORTION OF INFORMATION BULLETING PUBLISHED BY THE MOTOR VEHICLES DEPARTMENT IN THEIR WEBSITE

EXHIBIT P28 TRUE COPY OF RELEVANT PAGE OF POST BY THE HONOURABLE MINISTER FOR DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES IN HIS SOCIAL MEDIA PAGE

EXHIBIT P29 TRUE COPY OF RELEVANT PAGES FROM THE WEBSITE AS RTO SERVICE SOLICITING SERVICES RELATING MOTOR VEHICLES DEPARTMENT

Exhibit R5 (a) TRUE COPY OF REGISTRATION CERTIFICATE

RESPONDENT EXHIBITS

Exhibit R6(A) A TRUE COPY OF BOARD RESOLUTION SHOWING AND EMPOWERING DEPONENT DATED 12.04.2023

Exhibit R6(B) TRUE COPY OF CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION OF THE APPLICANT UNDER SOCIETIES REGISTRATION ACT XXI OF 1860

RESPONDENT EXHIBITS

Exhibit R5 A TRUE COPY OF REGISTRATION CERTIFICATE

Exhibit R6 A A TRUE COPY OF BOARD RESOLUTION SHOWING AND EMPOWERING DEPONENT DATED 12/4/2023

Exhibit R6 B TRUE COPY OF CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION OF THE APPLICANT UNDER SOCIETIES REGISTRATION ACT XXI OF 1860

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

Exhibit P30 TRUE COPY OF RELEVANT PAGES OF MINUTES WITH ANNEXURES OF THE 60TH MEETING OF CMVR-TSC

Exhibit P31 TRUE COPY OF REPRESENTATION DATED 16..04..2023 SUBMITTED BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN OF CMVR-TSC BY THE PETITIONER



Exhibit P32 TRUE COPY OF REPRESENTATION DATED 27..04..2023 SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE DIRECTOR OF AUTOMOTIVE RESEARCH ASSOCIATION OF INDIA (ARAI) ALONG WITH SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Exhibit P33 TRUE COPY OF COMMUNICATION NO.SHL/LETTER/2023-24 DATED 12..06..2023 SENT BY THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF AUTOMOTIVE RESEARCH ASSOCIATION OF INDIA, TO THE PETITIONER

EXHIBIT P34 TRUE COPY OF ADVISORY NO. RT-11036/99/2020-MVL DATED 09..06..2023 ISSUED BY THE MINISTRY OF ROAD TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS, NEW DELHI

RESPONDENT EXHIBITS

Exhibit R2(d) True copy of Government Order G.O(Rt) No. 39/2024/Trans Dated 24.01.2024.

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

Exhibit P11(a) TRUE COPY OF GOVERNMENT ORDER G.O. (RT) NO. 39/2024/TRANS DATED 24..01..2024 ISSUED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF KERALA

RESPONDENT EXHIBITS

Exhibit R-5(q) A PRINT OUT OF THE FUNCTION DOWNLOADED FROM \_ THE [HTTPS://MVD.KERALA.GOV.IN/EN/IDTR](https://mvd.kerala.gov.in/en/idtr)

Exhibit R-5(r) A TRUE COPY OF DETAILS THE 86 REGISTERING AUTHORITIES IN THE STATE OF KERALA

Exhibit R-5(s) TRUE COPY OF AIS 159 OF 2019

Exhibit R-5(t) COPY OF MORT&H LETTER NO RT11036/99/2020MVL DATED 29.12.2023

Exhibit R-5(u) TRUE COPY OF THE NOTIFICATION DATED 05.06.2020

Exhibit R-5(v) TRUE COPY OF THE COMMUNICATION DATED 08.01.2024

PETITIONER EXHIBITS



- EXHIBIT P36 TRUE COPY OF eTENDER NOTICE DATED 17..07..2024 INVITING BIDS BY THE THIRD RESPONDENT
- EXHIBIT P37 TRUE COPY OF RE-NOTIFIED TENDER NOTICE WITH DETAILS DATED 29..07..2024 ISSUED BY THE THIRD RESPONDENT
- EXHIBIT P38 TRUE COPY OF MINUTES RECORDED IN THE PRE-BID MEETING HELD ON 22..07..2024 IN THE OFFICE OF THE THIRD RESPONDENT
- EXHIBIT P35 TRUE COPY OF COMPLAINT DATED 28..09..2023 SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF POLICE - TRAFFIC, KOCHI
- EXHIBIT P39 TRUE COPY OF PUBLIC NOTICE NO. 5214/TD/RTO(HQ)/2021 DATED 10..07..2024 ISSUED BY THE TRANSPORT COMMISSIONER, TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
- RESPONDENT EXHIBITS
- Exhibit R5(w) A TRUE COPY OF THE NOTICE INVITING TENDER (NIT) NO. MIT2/13/2017-TC DATED 17.07.2024 ALONG WITH TENDER DOCUMENT
- Exhibit R5(x) A TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT IN C.P(C) 483 OF 2013 DATED 13.07.2016 OF THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT
- Exhibit R5(y) A TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER DATED 26.10.2023 ISSUED BY MINISTRY OF ROAD TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS
- Exhibit R5(z) A TRUE COPY OF THE AUTHORIZATION OF PETITIONERS IN VAHAN BY THE VEHICLE MANUFACTURER
- PETITIONER EXHIBITS
- Exhibit P11(b) TRUE COPY OF G.O.(RT) NO. 285/2024/TRANS DATED 30..07..2024 ISSUED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF KERALA
- RESPONDENT EXHIBITS
- EXHIBIT R2(e) TRUE COPY OF THE GOVERNMENT ORDER G.O.(Rt)



No.285/2024/TRANS DATED 30.07.2024

EXHIBIT R2(e)

TRUE COPY OF THE GOVERNMENT ORDER G.O.(Rt) No.  
285/2024/TRANS DATED 30.07.2024

PETITIONER ANNEXURES

ANNEXURE-A

TRUE COPY OF RELEVANT PAGES OF THE JUDGMENT DATED  
28..10..2019 IN W.P. (C) NO. 23021 OF 2018

ANNEXURE-B

TRUE COPY OF RELEVANT PAGES OF THE JUDGMENT DATED  
02..12..2022 IN W.P. (MD) NO. 27376 OF 2022 OF THE MADURAI BENCH  
OF THE MADRAS HIGH COURT

ANNEXURE-C

TRUE COPY OF RELEVANT PAGES OF JUDGMENT 23..02..2016 IN PIL  
NO. 3127 OF 2016 OF THE ALLAHABAD HIGH COURT