

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

**PRESENT:**

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

**MONDAY, THE 2ND DAY OF MARCH 2015/11TH PHALGUNA, 1936**

**WP(C).No.25063 of 2013 (G)**  
-----

**PETITIONER:**  
-----

**SUNIL K.T.,S/O.THANTHIKUNJU,  
KIYALIL HOUSE,MEEMPARA (PO),  
PUTHENCROUZ,ERNAKULAM DISTRICT,  
PIN-682 308 (OWNER OF TIPPER  
LORRY BEARING REG.NO.KL-40-F/5116)**

**BY SRI.A.V.THOMAS (SENIOR ADVOCATE.)  
ADVS.SMT.M.M.JASMIN  
SRI.NIDHI SAM JOHNS**

**RESPONDENT:**  
-----

**SUB INSPECTOR OF POLICE,  
PANANGAD POLICE STATION,  
PANANGAD,PIN.682506,ERNAKULAM DISTRICT.**

**BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SMT.ANITHA RAVINDRAN**

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD  
ON 02-03-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE  
FOLLOWING:**

**pk**

WP(C).No.25063 of 2013 (G)

**APPENDIX**

**PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:**

**EXT.P1-TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION OF THE TIPPER LORRY BEARING REGISTRATION NO.KL-40-F/5116.**

**EXT.P2-TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE OF INSURANCE.**

**EXT.P3-TRUE COPY OF THE GOODS CARRIAGE PERMIT DATED 10-02-2012 OF THE LORRY.**

**EXT.P4-TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE OF FITNESS 10-02-2012.**

**EXT.P5-TRUE COPY OF THE DRIVING LICENSE NO.17/3012/2001  
DATED 10-05-2013 ISSUED BY THE ASSISTANT LICENSING AUTHORITY,  
MUVATTUPUZHA TO THE DRIVER SUNIL C.K.**

**EXT.P6-TRUE COPY OF THE SEIZURE MAHAZAR DATED 05-10-2013 PREPARED  
BY THE FIRST RESPONDENT.**

**EXT.P7-TRUE COPY OF THE QUARRYING/MOVEMENT PERMIT DEALERS'  
LICENSE PASS DATED 05-10-2013 ISSUED BY DEPARTMENT OF MINING &  
GEOLOGY ERNAKULAM.**

**RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS:**

**NIL**

**//TRUE COPY//**

**P.S. TO JUDGE**

**pk**

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

=====

**W.P.(C) No.25063 of 2013**

=====

**Dated this the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of March, 2015**

**JUDGMENT**

The vehicle bearing Registration No.KL-40-F-5116 was seized by the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent alleging offence under the Mines and Mineral (Development and Regulation) Act and the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules. The main ground of challenge is that, the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent is not having the jurisdiction or authority to effect seizure.

2. Heard both the sides.

3. The authority of the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent to effect seizure has already been considered by this Court and the power and competence has been upheld as per the decision reported in **Aloshias C. Antony Vs. Government of Kerala** [2014(1) KLT 536]. The said decision was rendered, also taking note of the nature of offence which is a 'cognizable' one (notwithstanding anything contained in the Cr.P.C) as stipulated in Section 21(6) of MMDR Act, 1957 and also placing reliance on the judgment rendered by a Division Bench of this Court in **Construction Materials Movers Association V. State of Kerala** [2008 (4) KLT 909]. In the said circumstance, there is no tenable

ground to call for interference.

4. When the matter came up for consideration on 11.10.2013, the vehicle caused to be released, on satisfaction of a sum Rs.25,000/- and on execution of a simple bond. In the said circumstance, the further course of action required is to surrender the vehicle before the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent, so as to enable the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent to produce it before the concerned Magistrate having jurisdiction over the area and to proceed with steps for prosecution, unless the offence is sought to be compounded.

5. The petitioner expresses desire to compound the offence by virtue of the enabling provisions under the relevant provisions of law. This Court finds it fit and proper to permit the petitioner to have the offence compounded on satisfying the compounding fee of Rs.25,000/-. The amount ordered to be paid as per the interim order dated **11.10.2013** shall be treated as compounding fee and offence shall be treated as compounded. Once the offence is compounded, no prosecution proceedings will lie in view of the law declared by this Court in **Digil Vs. Sub Inspector of Police** [2013(1) KLT 600]. It shall be reported to the concerned Magistrate, if the crime has already been reported. If there is any failure in satisfying the compounding fee, the

1<sup>st</sup> respondent shall pursue further steps in connection with the prosecution before the concerned Magistrate having jurisdiction over the area.

The writ petition is disposed of.

Sd/-  
**P.R.RAMACHANDRA MENON, JUDGE**

vdv