

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.R.RAMACHANDRA MENON

FRIDAY, THE 27TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2015/8TH PHALGUNA, 1936

WP(C).No. 26470 of 2013 (G)

PETITIONER :

**PRADAPAN,AGED 30 YEARS, S/O. GOPI,
SREEKRISHNA VILASAM, THOTTAPPALLY P.O.,
AMBALAPPUZHA, ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT.**

BY ADV. SRI.P.SHANES

RESPONDENTS :

- 1. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR,
KOTTAYAM, KOTTAYAM DISTRICT-686 001.**
- 2. THE STATE POLICE CHIEF, POLICE HEAD QUARTERS,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 001.**
- 3. THE SUB INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
VAKATHANAM POLICE STATION, KOTTAYAM-686 135.**
- 4. THE VILLAGE OFFICER, VAKATHANAM,
VAKATHANAM, KOTTAYAM DISTRICT-686 135.**

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.M.MUHAMMED SHAFI

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD
ON 27-02-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED
THE FOLLOWING:**

sts

WP(C).No. 26470 of 2013 (G)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS

- P1 : COPY OF THE REGISTRATION CERTIFICATE OF THE VEHICLE REGISTRATION NO.KL-07-BE- 3812.
- P2 : COPY OF THE GOODS CARRIAGE PERMIT OF THE SAID VEHICLE ISSUED ON 12.3.2012.
- P3 : COPY OF THE LICENCE ISSUED TO SMT.MOLLY CHACKO UNDER RULE 4(1) OF THE KMMC RULES.
- P4 : COPY OF THE CASH MEMORANDUM ISSUED IN FAVOUR OF THE PETITIONER IN FORM-P IN TERMS OF RULE 48K OF KMMC RULES.
- P5 : COPY OF THE SCENE MAHAZAR PREPARED BY THE 4TH RSEPDENT DTD. 21.10.2013.

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS:

NIL

/TRUE COPY/

P.A.TO JUDGE

sts

P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON, J.

W.P.(C) No.26470 of 2013

Dated this the 27th day of February, 2015

JUDGMENT

The vehicle bearing No. KL-07-BE-3812 was seized by the 3rd respondent/S.I. of Police alleging offence under the MMDR Act/KMMC Rules. The main ground of challenge is that, the respondent is not having the jurisdiction or authority to effect seizure.

2. Heard both the sides.

3. The authority of the 3rd 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 **29.10.2013**, the vehicle was 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 respondent, so as to enable the concerned 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 29.10.2013 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 compounding the offence, the concerned respondent shall pursue further steps to **seize the vehicle** and proceed with steps for prosecution.

The writ petition is disposed of.

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

sp