

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.R.RAMACHANDRA MENON

MONDAY, THE 9TH DAY OF MARCH 2015/18TH PHALGUNA, 1936

WP(C).No. 29252 of 2012 (F)

PETITIONER(S):

**ANU T.S,
S/O.SIVASANKARAN, AGED 26 YEARS,
THEKKEDATHU KIZHAKKETHIL, ALA P.O.
ALA VILLAGE, CHENGANNUR TALUK, ALAPUZHA DISTRICT.**

BY ADV. SRI.AJITH MURALI

RESPONDENT(S):

- 1. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, ALAPPUZHA,
ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT - 688 001.**
- 2. THE THAHASILDAR,
CHENGANNUR TALUK, ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT - 689 121.**

R BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.M.MUHAMMED SHAFI

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON
09-03-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:**

AD/

WP(C).No. 29252 of 2012 (F)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS

**EXHIBIT-P1: THE TRUE COPY OF THE MAHZER SUBMITTED BY THE 2ND
RESPONDENT DATED 05.12.2012.**

EXHIBIT-P2: THE TRUE COPY OF THE REGISTRATION CERTIFICATE.

**EXHIBIT-P3: PHOTO COPY OF THE APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER
BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT DATED, 05.12.2012.**

**EXHIBIT-P4: PHOTO COPY OF THE APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY THE DRIVER OF
THE VEHICLE BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT DATED, 05.12.2012.**

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS

NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.A. TO JUDGE

AD/

P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON, J.

W.P.(C). No.29252 of 2012

Dated this the 9th day of March, 2015

JUDGMENT

The vehicle bearing No.KL-38-7919 was seized by the 2nd respondent 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 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 **7.12.2012**, the vehicle was caused to be released, **on execution of a simple bond**. In the said circumstance, the further course of action required is to surrender the vehicle before the concerned

W.P.(C). No.29252 of 2012

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 it compounded on satisfying the compounding fee of ₹25,000/- within **two weeks** from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment. 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 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.

rkc