

Vinodkumar Vs. Station House officer, Changaramkulam Police Station

Vinodkumar Vs. Station House officer, Changaramkulam Police Station

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/49486

Court : Kerala

Decided On : Mar-18-2015

Judge : Honourable Mr.Justice P.R.Ramachandra Menon

Appellant : Vinodkumar

Respondent : Station House officer, Changaramkulam Police Station

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM PRESENT: THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.R.RAMACHANDRA MENON WEDNESDAY, THE 18TH DAY OF MARCH 2015 27TH PHALGUNA, 1936 WP(C).No. 8469 of 2015 (G) ----- PETITIONER(S): ----- VINODKUMAR, AGED 38 YEARS, S/O.BALAN, PUTHUPARAMBIL HOUSE, KOLOLAMBA P.O., MALAPPURAM DISTRICT. BY ADV. SRI.S.SHAJAHAN (ADOOR). RESPONDENT(S): ----- 1. STATION HOUSE OFFICER, CHANGARAMKULAM POLICE STATION, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT.

2. SUB DIVISIONAL MAGISTRATE, MALAPPURAM.

3. DISTRICT COLLECTOR, CIVIL STATION, MALAPPURAM. BY GOVT. PLEADER SRI.JOSEPH GEORGE. THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 18-03-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING: rs. WP(C).No. 8469 of 2015 (G) APPENDIX PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:- EXT.P1 COPY OF THE SEIZURE MAHAZAR

PREPARED BY THE FIRST RESPONDENT DATED 25/02/2015. EXT.P2 COPY OF THE VALID PASS ISSUED BY DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION, MALAPPURAM. RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS:- NIL. //TRUE COPY// P.A. TO JUDGE rs. P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON, J.

===== W.P.(C). No. 8469 of 2015
----- Dated this the 18th day of March, 2015

JUDGMENT

The issue involved in this case is with regard to the seizure of vehicle belonging to the petitioner alleging illegal transportation of river sand.

2. Petitioner is the owner of the vehicle bearing No. KL-07- L-6282. The said vehicle was seized by the first respondent on 25.2.2015 with the insinuation as mentioned above. The grievance of the petitioner is that, though crime has been registered, the transportation has not been reported to the concerned judicial Magistrate having jurisdiction over the area which virtually prevents the petitioner, who is stated as innocent, from approaching the competent Court/forum to get interim custody of the vehicle and hence the writ petition. Reliance is sought to be placed on the verdict passed by this Court in Aboobacker v. State of Kerala (2014 (3) KLT26 in this regard.

3. The law now stands settled as to the course of action to W.P.C. No. 8469 of 2015 -2- be pursued if at all any offence under the Kerala Protection of the River Banks and Regulation of Removal of Sand Act, 2001, is committed. Two different courses of action are envisaged under the statute as made clear by the Division Bench of this Court in Sujith V State of Kerala (2012 (2) KLT547 to the effect that, apart from confiscation proceedings, prosecution proceedings are also mandatory, to be pursued.

4. Now, the question to be considered is with regard to the further course of action in connection with the confiscation/ prosecution proceedings and also with regard to the granting of interim custody of the vehicle. The competent authority to finalise the confiscation proceedings, as per the statute, is none other than the 2nd respondent/Revenue Divisional Officer (here Sub Divisional Magistrate) and there

cannot be any dispute in this regard. With regard to granting of interim custody, the matter had come up for consideration before a Full Bench of this Court and as per the decision reported in Shan C.T. v. State of Kerala [2010 (3) KHC333=2010(3)KLT413, the Bench observed that, interim custody of the vehicle could be released subject to satisfaction of 30% of the value of the vehicle and on W.P.C. No. 8469 of 2015 -3- furnishing security for the balance amount, giving further direction to have the confiscation proceedings finalised, within the time as stipulated therein. Paragraphs 12 and 13 of the said verdict read as follows:-

"2. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, we are of the opinion that interim custody of the vehicle can be granted on condition that the owner of the vehicle deposits 30% of the value of the vehicle as determined by the appropriate authority under the Motor Vehicles Act in cash and a further condition that the owner of the vehicle should provide either a bank guarantee or immovable property security for the balance of the value of the vehicle. The amount so deposited and the security furnished would follow the final outcome of the confiscation proceedings.

13. We also deem it appropriate to direct that the proceedings under S.23 of the above mentioned Act confiscating the vehicle shall be concluded within six weeks from the date of seizure of the vehicle as far as possible, in which case the need to consider the interim custody of the vehicle may not normally arise. But if for any reason the authorities under the Act are not able to conclude the proceedings within the period of six weeks mentioned above, the interim custody of the vehicle shall be given to the owner on the conditions specified earlier. It is also made clear that to avoid any controversy and the allegations of undue delay on the part of either party to the proceedings, the competent authority shall put the owner on notice within a period of three days of the date of seizure and the owner or any other person interested in the vehicle shall file his objections to the confiscation within a week thereafter." 5. Later, an issue came up for consideration before this Court, as to whether prosecution proceedings are mandatorily to W.P.C. No. 8469 of 2015 -4- be pursued in cases involving offences under the Kerala Protection of River Banks and Regulation of Removal of Sand Act. The said aspect was considered, pursuant to the reference made by a learned Single Judge. The law

was declared by a Division Bench, as per the verdict passed in *Sujith V State of Kerala* (2012 (2) KLT547, wherein it was observed that, prosecution in respect of the offence under the Kerala Protection of River Banks and Regulation of Removal of Sand Act was mandatorily to be pursued and that the matter was required to be reported to the concerned Judicial Magistrate having jurisdiction over the area, by filing proper complaint by the authorised Officers. The operative portion of the said verdict as contained in paragraph 13 reads as follows:

"3. Therefore, in exercise of jurisdiction under Art.226 of the Constitution of India, it is hereby ordered that the revenue and police authorities, while effecting seizure, shall ensure that any revenue official effecting the seizure, notifies such seizure, also to a police official, over and above the requirement in S.22 of the Act and the Rules. That police official may effect seizure of those goods and report such seizure to the jurisdictional Magistrate in accordance with law and any police officer effecting seizure shall, apart from reporting any such seizure to the jurisdictional Magistrate, also place a report of such seizure before the concerned revenue authority so that action can follow through the criminal court and through the revenue authority in terms of the laws. W.P.C. No. 8469 of 2015 -5- Following the aforesaid, it is further ordered that in all pending cases, the competent police officer shall effect seizure and report the same to the jurisdictional Magistrate, if not already done and the competent revenue authority shall make appropriate complaint to the jurisdictional Magistrate at the earliest. This would also enable the owners of the goods or vehicles to apply for interim custody in terms of S.451 or 457 CrI.P.C., as the case may be. In ordering release, the Judicial Magistrate shall be guided by the terms laid down by the Full Bench of this Court in *Shan V. State of Kerala* [2010

(3) KLT413(F.B.)]. The appropriate authorities shall also file complaints for initiating prosecution in all cases, where offences under the Act are disclosed. These directions shall apply in dealing with sand and vehicles, seized by the police or revenue authority under the provisions of the Act or the Code of Criminal Procedure, over and above the directions in *Moosakoya* (supra) and *Shoukathali* (supra), until appropriate legislative provisions are brought in, which event, we hope, shall come at the earliest."

6. It is seen that the statute was accordingly amended by the State by incorporating Section 23A with effect from 25.11.2012 in the following form: "23A. Confiscation of sand, vehicles, etc.-

(1) Where any property is seized under Section 23, the officer seizing such property shall seal all such properties for indicating that the same is seized and shall, whether prosecution proceedings have been initiated or not, within forty eight hours of such seizure make a report of such seizure before the Judicial Magistrate and before the Sub Divisional Magistrate having jurisdiction over the area from where the said properties are seized and the fact of such seizure shall be informed to the Station House Officer of the Police Station, having jurisdiction over the area. Where information regarding such seizure of property is received, the Police Officer concerned shall take steps under Section 102 of the Code of Criminal W.P.C. No. 8469 of 2015 -6- Procedure, 1973 (Central Act 2 of 1974).

(2) Where a report under sub-section

(1) is received before the Judicial Magistrate having jurisdiction, steps thereon, not contrary to the other provisions of this Act, shall be taken as per the provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Central Act 2 of 1974) and, if no claim is raised regarding the articles seized or where the Court is satisfied that the application to release them is not satisfactory, they shall be subjected to confiscation under sub-section (4): Provided that the release of the properties seized to any person, for its safe custody, to any person or its disposal, shall be on sufficient security and such release or disposal shall only be till the completion of the confiscation proceedings under this Act: Provided further that the sand seized shall not, for any reason, be released to any person and the same shall be subjected to confiscation under sub-section (4).

(3) Where a report under sub-section

(1) is received before a Sub-Divisional Magistrate, a notice requiring to furnish in writing within the stipulated time as stated in the notice, the reasons, if any, for not confiscating the property seized under Section 23, shall be issued to the owner of, or the person having control of, the vehicle, tool, implements, loading equipment,

or other article.

(4) Where the owner of the properties seized or the person having control of the same does not furnish explanation or the explanation given is not satisfactory, and the Sub-Divisional Magistrate is satisfied that the properties seized under Section 23 are to be confiscated, he shall, by an order, confiscate the same and the fact shall be informed in writing to its owner or the person having its control: Provided that the owner of the properties seized or the person having its control shall be given the liberty to reclaim it, except sand, by remitting an amount equal to the value of the confiscated articles, as fixed by the Collector, in lieu of the properties confiscated: Provided further that the sand confiscated shall not for any reason, be released by releasing the value.

(5) The amount received under sub-section

(4) W.P.C. No. 8469 of 2015 -7- shall, subject to the provisions of Section 23D, be remitted to the River Management Fund.

(6) The sand confiscated under sub-section

(4) shall be sold to Nirmithi Kendra or to 'Kalavara' at such rate, as may be fixed by the Public Works Department from time to time and such amount shall be remitted to the River Management Fund.

(7) The confiscation under this section shall be in addition to the penalty provided for the offence under this Act."

7. Sub section 2 of Section 23(A) deals with the course of action to be pursued by a Judicial Magistrate, when the report is received under Sub section (1). The said provision enables the Judicial Magistrate to release the interim custody of the vehicle, on being satisfied with the circumstances, which shall be on sufficient security subject to the confiscation under Sub section (4). The provision, particularly Sub Section

(1) of Section 23A, mandates the concerned Officer, who is effecting the seizure to report the same to the Judicial Magistrate and also before the Sub Divisional

Magistrate having jurisdiction over the area.

8. Sub section (3) of Section 23A deals with the course of action, to be followed by the Sub Divisional Magistrate. This evidently is in respect of the confiscation proceedings. On receipt of the report under Sub section 1 of Section 23A, notice has to be W.P.C. No. 8469 of 2015 -8- issued to the party concerned, with regard to the proposed steps for confiscation. Based on the explanation, if any, to be submitted by the party, the proceedings have to be finalised by the Sub Divisional Magistrate, as stated in Sub Section 4 of Section 23A. In other words, the power of confiscation conferred upon the Sub Divisional Magistrate under the statute is not available with the Judicial Magistrate, who is only to deal with the prosecution proceedings, with power to release the interim custody of the vehicle, till the confiscation proceedings are finalised.

9. An issue had come up for consideration before this Court, challenging the condition imposed by a Judicial Magistrate, whereby 30% of the value of the vehicle was directed to be deposited and the balance to be satisfied by way of Bank guarantee or immovable property. The consequence of the amendment brought about was also the subject matter of consideration. It was pointed out from the part of the Public Prosecutor that, the amendment by virtue of Section 23A did not change the existing position, with regard to the course of action, to be pursued by the 'Confiscating Authority'. The net result of W.P.C. No. 8469 of 2015 -9- the amendment was only to pursue the prosecution proceedings, for which necessary base/foundation was put up as per the amendment; simultaneously giving power to the Judicial Magistrate to release interim custody of the vehicle on sufficient security, till the confiscation proceedings are finalised under Sub section 4 of Section 23A. Considering the particular facts and circumstances of the said case, it was observed by a learned Judge of this Court as per the decision reported in *Aboobacker v. State of Kerala* (2014 (3) KLT26 that the condition imposed by the learned Magistrate was rather harsh and accordingly, the same was varied by causing the vehicle to be released on satisfaction of 15% of the value and on execution of a simple bond. After going through the relevant provisions of law, this Court finds that the power and procedure, as it existed earlier, have not undergone any substantial change, but for making the position clarified with regard to the

prosecution proceedings to be pursued, also conferring authority upon the Judicial Magistrate to deal with the interim custody of the vehicle till the confiscation proceedings are finalised by the Sub Divisional Magistrate. W.P.C. No. 8469 of 2015 -10- 10. Now, the question to be considered is, whether the Sub Divisional Magistrate is still having any power to grant interim custody. By virtue of the amendment, the power which was originally vested upon the Sub Divisional Magistrate, to have the confiscation proceedings to be initiated and finalised, has not been taken away, reduced or mitigated in any manner. The said authority remains to be the authority to deal with the confiscation proceedings. In so far as the power is vested upon Sub Divisional Magistrate to confiscate the vehicle, it is corollary to say that, on conclusion of the proceedings, if the Sub Divisional Magistrate is satisfied that the insinuating circumstances have not been made out, he can release the vehicle as well. If the said authority is having the power to confiscate or release the vehicle, as the case may be, it can't but be held that the authority is vested with incidental power to grant interim custody as well, subject to appropriate condition to be imposed.

11. With regard to the power of the Judicial Magistrate to grant interim custody, the provision, particularly the 'proviso' to Sub Section 2 of Section 23A, says that, it shall be on sufficient security and only till completion of the confiscation W.P.C. No. 8469 of 2015 -11- proceedings. The provision is quite categorical to the effect that, sufficiency of the security is an important aspect to be considered by the Judicial Magistrate, while releasing the vehicle. Sufficiency of security to grant interim custody of a vehicle/object which is liable to be confiscated, if proved, stands on a different pedestal than the sufficiency of security in the case of a vehicle/object which is connected with other offences, where it may have a bearing as part of evidence/connecting link. This is more so, when we consider the object of the statute (Kerala Protection of River Banks and Regulation of Removal of Sand Act, 2013), which as evident from the 'pre amble', is to "protect river banks and river beds from large scale dredging of river sand and to protect their biophysical environment system and regulate the removal of river sand and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto." 12. A peep into similar legislations, object of which is more to protect the natural resources and to prevent illicit extraction, may be beneficial. Section 20 of the Kerala Conservation of Paddy

Land and Wet Land Act, 2008 enables the District Collector to confiscate the vehicle/vessel etc. seized under the Act. 'Proviso' to Section 20(1) enables to spare the vehicle, in lieu of W.P.C. No. 8469 of 2015 -12- confiscation, on payment of a sum equal to 'one and a half times' the value of the seized article, as may be determined by the District Collector. Similarly, Section 61A of the Kerala Forest Act, 1961 enables the competent authority to confiscate the vehicle/article/object involved in a forest offence. Observations made by the Apex Court with reference to the provisions of the Karnataka Forest Act, 1963 in State of Karnataka Vs. K. Krishnan (JT2000(9) SC356 as to granting of interim custody are very relevant. It has been observed in paragraph 7 of the said verdict (rendered by the Bench consisting of their Lordships K.T Thomas and R.P. Sethi JJ) as follows: "The liberal approach in the matter would perpetuate the commission of more offences with respect to the forest and its produce which, if not protected, is surely to affect the mother-earth and the atmosphere surrounding it. The Courts cannot shut their eyes and ignore their obligations indicated in the Act enacted for the purposes of protecting and safeguarding both the forests and their produce. The forests are not only the natural wealth of the country but also protector of human life by providing a clean and unpolluted atmosphere. We are of the considered view that when any vehicle is seized on the allegation that it was used for committing a forest offence, the same shall not normally be returned to a party till the culmination of all the proceedings in respect of such offence, including confiscatory proceedings, if any. Nonetheless, if for any exceptional reasons a Court W.P.C. No. 8469 of 2015 -13- is inclined to release the vehicle during such pendency, furnishing a bank guarantee should be the minimum condition. No party shall be under the impression that release of vehicle would be possible on easier terms, when such vehicle is alleged to have been involved in commission of a forest offence. Any such easy release would tempt the forest offenders to repeat commission of such offences. Its casualty will be the forests as the same cannot be replenished for years to come." The above observations are quite relevant and attracted in the instant case as well, where the statute is more concerned with the protection of River banks and River beds from large scale dredging of River sand and to protect their biophysical environment system. As it stands so, this Court respectfully disagrees with the course ordered in 2014 (1) KLT26(cited supra).

Since the field is squarely covered by the decision rendered by a Full Bench of this Court (2010(3) KLT413[cited supra]) and since the amendment to Section 23A of the Act has not tilted the balance in any manner, this Court, being bound by the Full Bench, does not find it necessary to refer the matter to a Division Bench.

13. Sufficiency of the security as in the instant case will naturally depend upon the value of the vehicle and how the W.P.C. No. 8469 of 2015 -14- value has to be assessed, has already been made clear by this Court on many an occasion, by getting the same duly assessed by the authorities of the Motor Vehicle Department. The Full Bench of this Court in 2010 (3) KLT413(cited supra) laid down that the interim custody of the vehicle involving an offence under the Kerala Protection of River Banks and Regulation of Removal of Sand Act could be released, only subject to satisfaction of 30% of the value of the vehicle and on furnishing security for the balance amount as specified. The law laid down by the Full Bench stands as it is. The amendment of the statute, particularly by virtue of Section 23A, has not resulted any change or consequence with regard to the position as mentioned above, nor has the effect been watered down in any manner. In so far as the law declared by the Full Bench of this Court stands intact and not varied, no Magistrate or other Officers under the Act can act contrary to it. As such, the interim custody can be released only on satisfaction of 30% of the value of the vehicle and on furnishing security for the balance amount as ordered by the Full Bench.

14. This being the position, the petitioner is set at liberty to W.P.C. No. 8469 of 2015 -15- approach either the 2nd respondent or the concerned Judicial 1st Class Magistrate to have interim custody of the vehicle and if any such petition is filed, it shall be dealt with in accordance with the relevant provisions of law and in the light of the observations made by the Full Bench of this Court as per the decision cited supra, within 'two weeks' from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment. The adjudication proceedings shall be finalized by the 2nd respondent in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, at the earliest, at any rate, within 'six weeks' from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment. It also goes without saying that, it will be for the concerned Judicial Magistrate to proceed with further steps in connection with the prosecution proceedings. The petitioner shall produce a copy

of the judgment along with a copy of the writ petition before the second respondent for further steps. The writ petition is disposed of. P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON, JUDGE. kp/-

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com