

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.R.RAMACHANDRA MENON

FRIDAY, THE 20TH DAY OF MARCH 2015/29TH PHALGUNA, 1936

WP(C).No. 8391 of 2015 (Y)

PETITIONER(S):

**SUDHEER, S/O.IBRAHIM, AGED 38 YEARS,
KANJIRAPARAMBA, MANNAM P.O.,
PARAVUR VILLAGE, PARAVUR TALUK,
ERNAKULAM DISTRICT (OWNER OF LORRY
BEARING REGISTRATION NO.KL-40-D-8836,
KL-02-P-9046 AND JCB BEARING
REGISTRATION NO.KL-41-A-6982).**

BY ADV. SRI.P.M.ZIRAJ.

RESPONDENT(S):

**THE SUB INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
NORTH PARAVUR POLICE STATION,
ERNAKULAM DISTRICT, PIN-683 512.**

BY GOVT. PLEADER SRI.M. MUHAMMED SHAFI.

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 20-03-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

rs.

WP(C).No. 8391 of 2015 (Y)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:-

EXT P1 : TRUE COPY OF THE FIRST INFORMATION REPORT NO.0336
DATED 12-03-2015 OF NORTH PARAVUR POLICE STATION.

RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS:- NIL.

//TRUE COPY//

PA. TO JUDGE

rs.

P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON, J.

=====

W.P.(C). No. 8391 of 2015

Dated this the 20th day of March, 2015

JUDGMENT

Petitioner is the owner of the vehicles bearing Reg. No. **KL-40-D-8836, KL-02-P-9046 & KL-41-A-6982** which were seized by the respondent alleging illegal transportation of 'Ordinary earth' in contravention of the relevant provisions of the 'MMDR Act, 1957'/'KMMC Rules. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner would like to have the offence compounded and that the above mentioned vehicles might be caused to be released after accepting the compounding fee.

2. The issue involved in this case is, whether the petitioner, who has been proceeded against in respect of the offences under the Mines and Mineral (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957 and the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules, 2015 is entitled to have the offence compounded in view of the desire expressed from the part of the petitioner in this regard.

3. Heard the learned Government Pleader as well.

4. Section 23A of the 'Act' and the relevant Rules enable the parties to have the offence compounded. The Rules specifically stipulate that any offence under the Rules can be compounded subject to the satisfaction of the maximum fine prescribed under the Rules, which is stated as Rs.5,000/-. But in respect of the transportation of sand/earth without any valid pass/sanction, it is stated as an offence under the 'Act' by virtue of the incorporation of Section 4(1A), for which separate penalty is provided under the 'Act' itself. It was in the said circumstance, that this Court has passed orders enabling the parties to have interim custody of the vehicle, on satisfaction of a sum of Rs.25,000/-, also directing the concerned respondent to consider the application for compounding, if any.

5. A question arose before this Court as to whether the prosecution proceedings could be pursued further, once the offence is compounded in accordance with the relevant provisions. This issue has already been considered and decided by this Court in **2013 (1) KLT 600 (Digil v. Sub Inspector of Police)**, holding that, once the offence is compounded, there cannot be any further prosecution proceedings.

6. In view of the willingness expressed from the part of the petitioner to have the offence compounded, conceding the guilt, this Court finds it fit and proper to direct the respondent to compound the offence, if the petitioner files an application and satisfies a sum of **Rs. 25,000/-** towards compounding fee, in respect of each vehicle. It is ordered accordingly. On satisfaction of the compounding fee, the vehicle shall be released to the petitioner forthwith. It is made clear that once the offence alleged against the petitioner is compounded, no prosecution proceedings shall be pursued against him.

The writ petition is disposed of accordingly. The petitioner shall produce a copy of this judgment along with a copy of this writ petition before the respondent for further steps.

**P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON,
JUDGE.**

kp/-