This Court has not come across any provision in the MV Act contemplating grant of tourist permits. The MV Act contemplates grant of stage carriage permit, contract carriage permit, goods carriage permit and private service vehicle permit. Although, the permits of the nature referred to above, not being a temporary permit issued under Section 87 or a special permit referred to in Section 88(8), are to remain valid for a period of five years, in terms of Rule 83(3) of the Central Rules, the period of validity of a tourist permit shall not exceed one year at a time. It thus appears that in breach of Rule 83(3), tourist permits have been issued in favour of all the vehicles valid for five years from the date of issue.

It further appears from sub-rule (7) of Rule 85 of the Central Rules that a tourist vehicle is required to be painted white with a blue ribbon of 5 cms. at the centre of the exterior of the body and the word 'tourist' is required to be inserted on two sides of the vehicle within a circle of 60 cms. diameter. The conditions attached to the permits issued in favour of the clients of Mr. Rao do incorporate all the conditions mentioned in sub-rule (7). However, there appears to be no pleading in any of the petitions that the tourist vehicles of the petitioners have been painted white with a blue ribbon, as is required in terms of sub-rule (7) of Rule 83 of the Central Rules. This Court may take judicial notice of the rampant breach of the Central Rules being perpetrated in these islands since number of tourist vehicles on view have been found not to adhere to the condition mentioned in sub-rule (7).

These points are being highlighted to bring to the notice of the permit issuing authority, i.e. the STA that both the STA as well as the permit holders are guilty of violation of statutory provisions and it is high time that the statutory provisions are not honoured in