

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM**

**PRESENT:**

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.R.RAMACHANDRA MENON**

**THURSDAY, THE 19TH DAY OF MARCH 2015/28TH PHALGUNA, 1936**

**WP(C).No. 8770 of 2015 (U)**  
-----

**PETITIONER(S):**  
-----

**SHALVI BABY ,  
W/O.BABY, AGED 48 YEARS,  
KOOTTASSERIL HOUSE,  
KOKKAPPILLY.P.O.,  
THIRUVANIYUR VILLAGE,  
KUNNATHUNADU TALUK,  
ERNAKULAM DISTRICT.  
(OWNER OF LORRY BEARING REGISTRATION NO.KL-40-231)**

**BY ADV. SRI.P.M.ZIRAJ**

**RESPONDENT:**  
-----

**THE SUB INSPECTOR OF POLICE,  
PUTHENCRUIZ POLICE STATION,  
ERNAKULAM DISTRICT,  
PIN -682031.**

**R1 BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.K.C.VINCENT (SR)**

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION  
ON 19-03-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE  
FOLLOWING:**

**vmr**

**WP(C).No. 8770 of 2015 (U)**  
-----

**APPENDIX**

**PETITIONERS EXHIBIT**  
-----

**EXHIBIT P1 - TRUE COPY OF THE MAHAZAR DATED 17/03/2015 PREPARED BY THE  
RESPONDENT.**

**RESPONDENTS EXHIBIT : NIL**  
-----

**/TRUE COPY/**

**P.A.TO JUDGE**

**vmr**

**P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON, J.**

=====

W.P.(C). No. 8770 of 2015

-----

Dated this the 19<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2015

**JUDGMENT**

Petitioner is the owner of the vehicle bearing Reg. No. **KL-40-231**, which was 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 vehicle 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. 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 her.

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/-