

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.R.RAMACHANDRA MENON

FRIDAY, THE 9TH DAY OF JANUARY 2015/19TH POUSHA, 1936

WP(C).No. 35552 of 2014 (T)

PETITIONER :

**SHANAVAS
SON OF HASSAN, AGED 32 YEARS
RESIDING AT ULLALIMUNDETH HOUSE
SOUTH VAZHAKKULAM, VAZHAKKULAM VILLAGE
KUNNATHUNADU TALUK
ERNAKULAM DISTRICT
(OWNER OF LORRY BEARING REGISTRATION NO.KL-40-J-7854)**

**BY ADVS.SRI.P.M.ZIRAJ
SRI.A.M.ABDULLA
SRI.O.M.SAJAYAN
SRI.K.S.DHANESH KUMAR
SRI.K.S.SREENATH
SMT.RESHMA P.JOSEPH
SMT.SUBI K
SRI.P.MOHAMED SABAH**

RESPONDENT :

**THE SUB INSPECTOR OF POLICE
PALARIVATTOM POLICE STATION, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT
PIN:683101.**

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

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 09-01-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

Mn

...2/-

WP(C).No. 35552 of 2014 (T)

APPENDIX

PETITIONERS' EXHIBITS :

**EXHIBIT P1: TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT OF THIS HONOURABLE COURT
DATED 20.12.2014 IN WPC NO.35157 OF 2014.**

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS : NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.A. TO JUDGE

Mn

P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON, J.

=====

W.P.(C). No. 35552 of 2014

Dated this the 9th day of January, 2015

JUDGMENT

Petitioner is the owner of the vehicle bearing Reg. No. **KL-40-J-7854**, which was seized by the respondent alleging illegal transportation of 'Ordinary earth'. The case of the petitioner is that, he was only transporting slurry(liquid mud), which is not a minor mineral and hence seizure of the vehicle alleging violation of the relevant provisions of the 'MMDR Act, 1957'/'KMMC Rules, 1967, is per se wrong and unsustainable.

2. Heard the learned Government Pleader as well, who rebutted the version of the learned counsel for the petitioner pointing out that, the commodity transported is also a minor mineral as defined under the relevant provisions of 'MMDR Act, 1957'/'KMMC Rules, 1967.

3. 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.

4. Section 23A of the 'MMDR Act' and Rule 60A of the 'KMMC Rules' enable the party to have the offence compounded. The question whether prosecution proceedings could be pursued further, once the offence is compounded in accordance with the relevant provisions of the MMDR Act/Rules 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.

5. 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 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.

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 satisfies a sum of **Rs. 25,000/-** . 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 him.

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 concerned respondent for further steps.

**P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON,
JUDGE.**