

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE ANIL K.NARENDRA

FRIDAY, THE 24TH DAY OF APRIL 2015/4TH VAISAKHA, 1937

WP(C).No.13039 of 2015 (D)

PETITIONER:

**ANTU,S/O.OUSEPH,AGED 53 YEARS,
MADASSERY HOUSE,MOOKKANNOOR P.O,
MOOKKANNOOR VILLAGE,ALUVA TALUK,
ERNAKULAM DISTRICT,
(OWNER OF LORRIES BEARING REGISTRATION NO KL-63-5377
KL-41-A-7851 KL-41-5123 AND A JCB BEARING REGISTRATION
NO.KL-41-D-3961)**

BY ADV.SRI.P.M.ZIRAJ

RESPONDENT:

**THE SUB INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
ANGAMALY POLICE STATION,
ERNAKULAM DISTRICT,PIN-682301**

BY GOVT. PLEADER SRI.K.C.VINCENT.

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 24-04-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

pk

WP(C).No.13039 of 2015 (D)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS

**EXT.P1:TRUE COPY OF THE MAHAZAR DATED 17/4/2015 PREPARED BY THE
RESPONDENT.**

**EXT.P2:TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT OF THIS HONOURABLE COURT
DATED 8/4/2015 IN WPC NO 11214 OF 2015**

RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS: NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.S. TO JUDGE

pk

ANIL K. NARENDRAN, J.,

W.P.(C)No.13039 of 2015

Dated this the 24th day of April, 2015

JUDGMENT

The petitioner is the owner of lorries bearing Registration Nos.KL-63-5337, KL-41-A-7851, KL-41-5123 and a JCB bearing Registration No.KL-41-D-3961, which were seized by the respondent alleging illegal transportation of 'ordinary earth' in contravention of the relevant provisions of the 'MMDR Act, 1957'/'KMM(PIMST) Rules, 2015'. 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. Heard the learned Government Pleader as well, who submits that, no valid supporting document was there and that the offence involved is under the MMDR Act/ KMM(PIMST) Rules. No offence under the Kerala Conservation of Paddy Land and Wet Land Act, 2008 or 'Sand Act' is stated as involved.

3. Section 23A of the Act and Rule 32 of the Rules enable

the party to have the offence compounded. The question whether the prosecution proceedings could be pursued further, once the offence is compounded in accordance with the relevant provisions of the MMDR Act 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. The directions given as per the above verdict are extracted below :

"i) In cases where compounding applications have been acted upon as per the interim orders passed by this Court and the offences have been compounded and compounding fees have been collected and vehicles have been released, it is declared that no further proceedings can be taken for confiscation of the vehicles;

ii) In cases where complaints have been filed before the Court but compounding applications have been entertained and offences have been compounded, appropriate applications will be filed before the Courts and the concerned Courts will pass appropriate orders in the matter with regard to the closure of the cases pending;

iii) In cases where compounding applications are yet to be filed by the parties concerned, it is open to them to file applications which will be dealt with by the officer concerned in accordance with law and they will be free to pass appropriate orders on it. If no applications are filed within a period of three weeks from today and if compounding is not being allowed, it is open to the concerned officers to complete the procedures as enjoined by law."

After hearing both the sides, this Court finds that the petitioner is

also entitled to have similar relief.

4. Coming to the extent of amount to be satisfied as compounding fee, 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' itself by virtue of the incorporation of Section 4(1A), for which separate penalty is provided under the Act itself. The maximum fine in respect of such offence prescribed under the Act is stated as **Rs.25,000/-**. It was in the said circumstance, that this Court was passing orders enabling the party 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. 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 satisfies a sum of **Rs.25,000/-** in respect of each vehicle. It is ordered

accordingly. On satisfaction of the compounding fee, the vehicles 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 stands 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.

Sd/-

ANIL K. NARENDRAN
JUDGE

sd