

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 6TH DAY OF APRIL, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANU SIVARAMAN

AND

THE HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE TARA VITASTA GANJU

WRIT PETITION (HABEAS CORPUS) NO.117 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

SRI DHANDAPANI J.
S/O JEEVA SAMPATH K.,
AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS,
NO.23, D TAIL BLOCK,
CHAMPIONREEFS, KGF,
KOLAR-563 117.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. RANGANATH REDDY R., ADV.,)

AND:

- 1 . STATE OF KARNATAKA,
BY ITS UNDER SECRETARY,
LAW AND ORDER DEPARTMENT,
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
BENGALURU-560 001.
- 2 . STATE OF KARNATAKA,
BY ITS DEPUTY SECRETARY,
LAW AND ORDER DEPARTMENT,
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
BENGALURU-560 001.
- 3 . THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
AND DISTRICT MAGISTRATE
KOLAR DISTRICT
KOLAR-563 103.

- 4 . THE DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE
KOLAR DISTRICT,
NO. 413, 2nd MAIN ROAD,
GANDHI NAGAR,
KOLAR-563 101.
- 5 . THE POLICE INSPECTOR,
ANDERSONPET POLICE STATION,
KGF, KOLAR-563 113.
- 6 . THE SUPERINTENDENT
CENTRAL PRISON,
PARAPANA AGRAHARA,
BENGALURU-560 100.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.B.A.BELLIAPPA, SPP-1 A/W
SRI. P. THEJESH, HCGP)

THIS WP(HC) IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF the CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO ISSUE A WRIT IN THE NATURE OF HABEAS CORPUS AND TO DECLARE THAT THE DETENTION ORDER NO.MAG (2)/CR/L AND O/02/2025-26 DATED 02.07.2025 VIDE ANNEXURE-A PASSED BY THIRD RESPONDENT AND GOVERNMENT ORDER NO.HD 325 SST 2025 DATED 10.07.2025 VIDE ANNEXURE-C PASSED BY FIRST RESPONDENT AND GOVERNMENT EXTENSION OF DETENTION ORDER NO.HD 325 SST 2025 DATED 16.08.2025 VIDE ANNEXURE-D PASSED BY SECOND RESPONDENT AS ILLEGAL AND VOID AND THE SET THE DETENUE AT LIBERTY .

THIS WP(HC) HAVING BEEN HEARD AND RESERVED FOR JUDGMENT ON 16.03.2026 AND COMING ON FOR PRONOUNCEMENT OF JUDGMENT THIS DAY, **ANU SIVARAMAN J.**, PRONOUNCED THE FOLLOWING:

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANU SIVARAMAN
and
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE TARA VITASTA GANJU

CAV JUDGMENT

(PER: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANU SIVARAMAN)

This Writ Petition (Habeas Corpus) is filed praying to declare the Detention Order No.MAG(2)/CR/L and O/02/2025-26 dated 02.07.2025 passed by respondent No.3 and Government Order No.HD 325 SST 2025 dated 10.07.2025 passed by respondent No.1 and Government Extension of Detention Order No.HD 325 SST 2025 dated 16.08.2025 passed by respondent No.2, under Section 3(1) of the Karnataka Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Gamblers, Goondas (Immoral Traffic Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video and Audio Pirates) Act, 1985, ('1985 Act' for short) as illegal and void and direct that the detainee be set at liberty.

2. We have heard Shri. Ranganath Reddy R, learned counsel appearing for the writ petitioner and Shri. B.A. Belliappa, learned State Public Prosecutor-1 along with Shri.

P. Thejesh, learned High Court Government Pleader appearing for the respondents.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the writ petitioner challenges the Order of Detention on five major grounds. They are as follows:-

"Ground No. 1

The detention order has been passed without considering the lack of proximity, there being a gap of six months from the date of registration of the last crime. The last crime registered against the detainee is dated 18.11.2024, whereas the detention order has been passed on 02.07.2025.

Authority Relied Upon:

WP (H.C.) No. 111/2024, Sivakumar vs State of Karnataka & Others, Page No.20, Paragraph No.23.

Ground No. 2

The State has not sought cancellation of bail even if the detainee had allegedly violated any bail conditions. Further, the detaining authority has not specified which bail conditions were violated by the detainee in the detention order. Hence subjective satisfaction arrived at by the detaining authority suffers from complete non-application of mind.

Authorities Relied Upon:

W.P. (H.C.) No. 4/2025, Anil Reddy vs State of Karnataka, dated 28.02.2025 Page Nos.30 to 38, Paragraph Nos.15 to 17.

Ground No. 3

The activities of the detainee are not prejudicial to public order, as they do not affect the community or the public at large. Mere disturbance of law and order leading to disorder is not a sufficient ground for preventive detention.

Authority Relied Upon:

- *ANU @ Aniket vs Union of India, in Criminal Appeal No.2920/2025, dated 27.05.2025, Page No.18, Paragraph No.30.*
- *Criminal Appeal No. 18223/2025, Roshini Devi vs State of Telangana, dated 08.01.2026, Paragraph Nos. 8 and 10.*

Ground No. 4

The detaining authority has failed to inform the time period available to the detainee to make a representation to the Government, though Section 3(3) of the Act mandates that the detention order must be approved by the Government within 12 days. The detention order was passed and served on 02.07.2025, approved by the State Government on 10.07.2025 and the representation was submitted by the detainee to the advisory board on 14.07.2025.

Authorities Relied Upon:

- *2025: JKLHC-JMU: 276, Mohd. Jaffer Sheikh vs Union Territory of J & K, dated 10.09.2025, Paragraph Nos. 8, 9 and 10.*

- (2004) CrLJ 2967, *Jitendra Nath Mishra vs District Magistrate & Another*, Paragraph Nos. 9 and 10.

Ground No.5

The confirmation order dated 9/10/2025 passed by the 2nd respondent, the 2nd respondent has not considered the representation of the Petitioner independently irrespective of the advisory board considering the representation of the detenu.

Authorities Relied Upon:

Amreen vs Commissioner of Police and others in WP HC No.87/2025 dated 23/10/2025 (Paragraphs No.13,14,15,16,19).

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has filed synopsis of additional grounds which reads as follows:-

"1. The Detaining authority has mentioned the wrong date of grant of bail to the detenu in Cr. No.30/2024 registered by Oorgaum police station.

The detaining authority has mentioned that the date of grant of bail in Cr. No.30/2024 as 13.06.2024. The Learned District and Sessions Judge has rejected the bail application of the detenu in CrL. Misc. No.493/2024 and thereafter has granted bail to the detenu in Cr. No.30/2024 in CrL. Misc. No.706/2024 on 17.08.2024.

Therefore the Detaining authority has relied upon the wrong bail date granted to the detenue as 13.06.2024 in which the bail application of the detenue was dismissed and therefore the same clearly shows non application of mind of the detaining authority in passing the detention order.

2. The Detaining authority has mentioned a Cr. No.280/2024 registered by the Andersonpet police station which does not exist.

The Detaining authority has mentioned that a case in Cr. No.280/2024 is registered against the detenue by Andersonpet Police Station. Upon due verification of the entire FIR register of the year 2024 registered before the Addl. Civil Judge and JMFC at KGF, Kolar it is found that there exists no such crime registered by Andersonpet Police Station. Therefore, the detaining authority has relied upon a Cr. No.280/2024 which is non existing and has passed the detention order is unsustainable in law and liable to be quashed by this Hon'ble Court."

5. The learned counsel appearing for the writ petitioner has relied on the following decisions:-

- **Sri. Shivakumar A v. The State of Karnataka & Ors,** passed in **WPHC No.111/2024** by Order **dated 01.02.2025;**

- ***Sri. Anil Kumar V. v. Commissioner of Police & Ors***, passed in ***WPHC No.4/2025*** by Order ***dated 28.02.2025***;
- ***Annu @ Aniket through his Father as next friend Krupal Singh Thakur v. Union of India & Ors***, passed in ***Crl. Appeal No.2920/2025*** by Order ***dated 27.06.2025***;
- ***Roshini Devi v. The State of Telangana & Ors.***, passed in ***Crl. Appeal No.18223/2025*** by Order ***dated 08.01.2026***;
- ***Mohd Jaffer Sheikh v. Union Territory of J & K & Ors***, reported in ***2025:JKLHC-JMU:276***;
- ***Jitendra Nath Mishra v. Dist. Magistrate & Ors***, reported in ***(2004) All.LJ 1829***;
- ***Amreen v. Commissioner of Police, Bengaluru & Ors***, passed in ***WPHC No.87/2025*** by Order ***dated 23.10.2025***;
- ***Suresh B. Shetty v. State of Karnataka, by its Secretary***, reported in ***(2019) 1 Kant.LJ 552***;
- ***G. Jyothi v. State of Telangana***, reported in ***(2017) 3 ALT 585***;
- ***Shamas Din v. UT of J&K and Ors***, passed in ***HCP No.62/2025*** by order ***dated 01.09.2025***;
and

- **Sri Narendra Gopal Gowda A. N. v. State of Karnataka & Ors,** passed in **WPHC No.110/2025** by order **dated 24.02.2026;**

6. The learned State Public Prosecutor-1 appearing for the respondents has placed a detailed statement of objections on record. It is contended that the petitioner's brother Vijaya Varman @ Sunoj is a habitual offender involved in 14 criminal cases, including murder, attempt to murder, robbery, rioting, hurt, and house-breaking registered across multiple police stations. His conduct is posing a continuing threat to public order with a tendency to use violence, deadly weapons and intimidation for unlawful gain. The consolidated statement of the criminal cases registered against the detainee is given below:-

SL. No	Police Station & Crime No	Sections of Law (IPC/BNS)	Short Description of Incident	Stage / Status
1	Andersonpet PS 191/2017	143, 147, 148, 302, 201, 202, 120B, 149 IPC	Alleged involvement with a group in a murder case and destruction of evidence	Acquitted on 16.04.2019
2	Andersonpet PS 21/2022	506, 504, 323, 324, 34 IPC	Assaulted victims with weapons during a quarrel, causing simple injuries	Acquitted on 12.12.2023

3	Andersonpet PS 118/2022	323, 324, 143, 427, 504, 506, 144, 147, 201, 149 IPC	Gang assault causing injuries and property damage; intimidation of complainant	Pending Trial (CC 5359/2024)
4	Andersonpet PS 104/2024	309(4), 60 BNS- 2023	Involved in a violent altercation leading to serious hurt under BNS provisions	Pending Trial (PT in CC 840/2025)
5	Andersonpet PS 280/2024	129(e), 129(g) BNSS-2023	Habitual rowdy behaviour; bound over due to repeated disturbances to public order	Bound Over (MAG Cr. No. 250/2024)
6	Marikuppam PS 23/2017	392 IPC	Robbery case involving snatching of valuables using force	Acquitted on 22.11.2023
7	Champion Reef PS 97/2018	341, 323, 324, 506, 307, 34 IPC	Attacked victim with deadly weapons; attempt to murder alleged	Acquitted on 23.03.2019
8	Champion Reef PS 35/2019	323, 324, 34 IPC	Assault causing simple injuries during a group clash	Acquitted on 13.12.2023
9	Robertsonpet PS 216/2018	454, 457, 380 IPC	House-breaking at night and theft of valuables	Acquitted on 05.12.2022
10	Oorgaum PS 26/2022	323, 324, 504, 34 IPC	Assault and verbal abuse during a personal rivalry incident	Acquitted on 04.10.2023
11	Oorgaum PS 48/2022	427, 341, 506 IPC	Wrongful restraint and property damage, issued threats to victim	Acquitted on 05.09.2023
12	Oorgaum PS 07/2023	143, 144, 147, 148, 504, 307, 302, 201, 149 IPC	Group attack resulting in fatal injuries; alleged murder and destruction of	Acquitted on 06.04.2024

			evidence	
13	Oorgaum PS 30/2024	504, 143, 144, 147, 148, 149, 323, 307 IPC	Violent group clash with attempt to murder; caused injuries with weapons	Pending Trial
14	Oorgaum PS 54/2024	189(2), 189(4), 191(2), 191(3), 324(4), 352, , 109, 190 BNS- 2023	Threatened public with weapons, caused hurt, instigated group violence	Pending Trial

7. It is further submitted that Rowdy Sheets were opened against the detainee at Andersonpet Police Station on 08.09.2020 and Oorgaum Police Station on 06.03.2024 and he has been under continuous surveillance. Despite repeated arrests, periods of judicial custody and release on bail, he is alleged to have shown no signs of reform and to have persistently engaged in violent and anti-social conduct. The ordinary criminal law has been ineffective in curbing the activities of the detainee making preventive detention necessary under Section 8 of the 1985 Act. Based on the materials and recommendations from the Deputy Superintendent of Police, the District Magistrate, Kolar recorded satisfaction that the detainee is a 'Goonda' as defined under Section 2(g) of the 1985 Act. A Detention

Order was passed on 02.07.2025 and was communicated to the detainee on the same day. The detainee was informed of the grounds of detention and his rights to make representations to the Detaining Authority, the State Government and the Advisory Board. He was also informed of his right to appear before the Advisory Board and be heard in person or through a non-legal representative.

8. On 10.07.2025, the State Government approved the Detention Order and the approval was communicated to the detainee. On 14.07.2025, the Detention Order, grounds of detention, and relied upon documents were forwarded to the Chairman of the Advisory Board, Bengaluru. On the same day, the detainee submitted representations to respondent No.2 and the Advisory Board. On 18.07.2025, the representation of the detainee was placed before the Advisory Board. The representation submitted by the detainee was also considered and rejected by the State Government and the rejection of the representation was communicated to the detainee on 21.07.2025. Thereafter, on 04.08.2025, the Advisory Board held its meeting and on

14.08.2025, it submitted a report along with proceedings dated 04.08.2025 to the State Government. Based on the said report, the State Government, by Order dated 16.08.2025, confirmed the Detention Order for a period of one year from 02.07.2025. The confirmation order was communicated to the detainee on 18.08.2025.

9. Further, as regards the grounds raised by the writ petitioner, it is contended that the last incident dated 18.11.2024 involved an unlawful assembly armed with deadly weapons with intent to commit murder, thereby affecting public order. Despite securing bail on 03.06.2025, the detainee continued to pose an imminent threat to society, warranting preventive detention. The detention order dated 02.07.2025 was issued within a reasonable and proximate timeframe, considering the detainee's consistent criminal propensity and likelihood of reoffending. The detention is based on a pattern of habitual criminal conduct and its cumulative impact, not on an isolated incident and thus does not violate Article 21 of the Constitution of India or suffer from non-application of mind.

10. It is further contended that the petitioner's attempt to trivialize the detainee's actions as mere law and order issues is contrary to both the record and settled law. The detainee has repeatedly engaged in serious and violent offences thereby creating fear and disturbing public order. The grounds of detention indicate that victims and witnesses have been reluctant to come forward due to fear of retaliation. The grant of bail does not diminish the gravity of the offences or limit the State's authority to invoke preventive detention where ordinary criminal law has proven ineffective. The recurring pattern of violent conduct, particularly following release on bail, justifies the invocation of the 1985 Act to safeguard public order.

11. The allegation that the detainee was not informed of his right to make a representation or the procedure is factually incorrect. The grounds of detention clearly communicated his right to submit representations to the detaining authority, the State Government and the Advisory Board through the Superintendent of Central Prison, Bengaluru. He was also informed that the matter would be

placed before the Advisory Board within the statutory period under Section 9 of the 1985 Act. As Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India only requires communication of the right to make a representation and not a fixed time frame in the grounds and hence no constitutional violation arises.

12. It is further contended that all material documents relied upon by the detaining authority for arriving at subjective satisfaction were furnished to the detainee, including records of criminal cases, bail status, and police reports, as part of the grounds of detention. This ensured that the detainee could make an effective representation. The claim of non-supply of documents is vague, unsupported by particulars and raised only as an afterthought. As no prejudice has been shown, the contention is untenable and liable to be rejected.

13. It is further contended that the confirmation order dated 09.10.2025 was issued in strict compliance with Section 12 of the 1985 Act, following the Advisory Board's opinion under Section 9 of the 1985 Act that sufficient cause for detention existed. The law does not require the

confirmation order to reproduce the detailed reasoning of the Advisory Board. It is sufficient that the Government considers the report and arrives at its satisfaction.

14. It is further contended that the subjective satisfaction of the detaining authority is clearly established through a detailed narration of facts, verification of police records and consideration of the detainee's criminal antecedents. The detention order demonstrates that the activities of the detainee go beyond individual disputes and have a direct impact on public order, thereby, satisfying the statutory requirements.

15. Having considered the contentions advanced, we notice that the contention raised with regard to lack of proximity of the order of detention to the last prejudicial activity, is not valid in the instant case since the detainee was admittedly in judicial custody in the last case till 03.06.2025. There are four crimes pending trial against the detainee. The detaining authority has considered the nature of the offences as well as the preventive steps under the

criminal law taken against the detainee and has come to the conclusion that such steps are not sufficient to restrain the criminal activities of the detainee. It has also been considered that in view of his past conduct, there is every likelihood of the detainee engaging in further crimes threatening public order and that the preventive detention is essential. In the said circumstances, we are of the opinion that the ground of lack of proximity is not available in the instant case.

16. With regard to the contention that the State has not sought for cancellation of bail, the respondents contend that the detainee had engaged in crimes while he was on bail in earlier cases. Further, Rowdy Sheets were opened against him at Andersonpet Police Station on 08.09.2020 and Oorgaum Police Station on 06.03.2024, which have also not deterred him. In the said circumstances, the said ground is not sustainable.

17. The pending cases against the detainee are with regard to grievous hurt, violent groupclash, attempt to

murder, gang assault, group violence etc. In the case of ***Arjun s/o Ratan Gaikwad v. State of Maharashtra and Others*** reported in **2024 SCC OnLine SC 3718**, the Apex Court has clearly laid that for an act to qualify as a disturbance to public, it must:-

1. Have an impact on the boarder community,
2. Evoke feelings of fear, panic and insecurity, and
3. Disturb the current life of the community.

These aspects have been specifically stated in the order of detention as under:-

" x x x x x You are in the habit of absconding after the registration against you. Offences committed by you have caused harm, danger and feeling of fear among the general public, tranquility and order is deemed to have been adversely affected.

There is no doubt that you will continue to indulge in this habitual criminal and GOONDA activities which will disrupt normalcy in KGF district and Bangalore city adversely. Action taken against you under the Indian Penal Code has had no effect on you and you continue to freely indulge in criminal and anti-social activities. You will continue to indulge in activities detrimental to public order while you are facing trial.

Therefore due to above mentioned reasons, as a precautionary measure, to protect the interest of public

and to prevent future attacks and protect public order, peace and tranquility it is essential to proceed against you under the Karnataka Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug-Offenders, Gamblers, GOONDAS, Immortal Traffic Offenders, Slum Grabbers Act 1985 (Karnataka Act No.12 of 1985).

x x x x x"

18. Further, the ground of non-mentioning of twelve days time for making of the representation in the Order of Detention is also not a sustainable ground. Though, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that there are decisions to the effect that the representation to the detaining authority has to be made within twelve days from making of the order, we are unable to agree with the said proposition.

19. Section 3(3) of the 1985 Act only provides a timeline of twelve days within which an order made by an officer mentioned in sub-Section 2 of the 1985 Act has to be approved by the State Government. However, the said provision does not provide that a representation made to the detaining authority or to the Government need not be considered beyond the said period of twelve days. In the

case of ***K.M. Abdulla Kunhi and B.L. Abdul Khader v. Union of India and others*** reported in ***(1991) 1 SCC 476***, the Apex Court has considered the provisions of Conservation of Foreign Exchange and Prevention of Smuggling Activities Act, 1974 and has held that the right to make a representation as provided under clause (4) and (5) of Article 22 of the Constitution of India is an absolute right and there is no time limit provided for consideration of the representation. If a representation is filed before any of the authorities, the same has to be considered in accordance with law. The mere fact that the twelve days time for approval by the State Government is not specifically mentioned in the order will make no difference to the situation. Any finding to the contrary in the judgments of the High Courts relied on by the writ petitioner would not be good law in the light of the law laid down by the Apex Court.

20. In the instant case, the order of detention specifically provides as follows:-

" x x x x x

If you desire to make any representation against the said order of detention to me you may do so and submit it through the Superintendent, Central prison, Bangalore.

If you desire to make any representation against the said order of detention to the Government of Karnataka, you may do so under address it to the Superintendent, Central prison Bangalore.

You are informed that the State Government shall within three weeks from the date of your detention make a reference to and place the requisite material before the Advisory Board, constituted under Section 9 of the Karnataka Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug-Offenders, Gamblers, GOONDAS, Immortal Traffic Offenders, Slum Grabbers Act 1985 (Karnataka Act No.12 of 1985), to enable the advisory board to make a report whether in its opinion there is sufficient cause for your detention.

You are also hereby informed that if you want to submit any representation to the Advisory Board against the detention order you may do so and address it to the Chairman, Advisory Board constituted under the said Act, and submit it through the Superintendent, Central prison Bangalore where you are detained.

You are further informed that Advisory Board shall hear you in person in due course, if the Board considers it essential to do so or if you so desire. If you desire to be heard in person by the Advisory Board you may intimate your desire to the Government. Where you are detained. So that the Advisory Board may be intimated about it and

the arrangements may be made to produce you before the Advisory Board, on the date to be fixed by it for the purpose. If you decide to be represented through a friend or an agent before the Advisory Board, you may intimate his name to the undersigned through the Superintendent, Central prison, Bangalore to place the same before the Advisory Board. You may also keep your friend ready to appear before the Advisory Board on the date to be notified and intimated to you later. Your friend or agent should not be legal practitioner or comrade in the trade.

x x x x x."

21. In the circumstances, we find that the right to submit a representation has been specifically informed to the writ petitioner. However, no representation was filed before the detaining authority. The representations filed before the Government and the Advisory Board have been duly considered as well.

22. Learned SPP-1 has also relied on the judgment in ***Gautam Jain v. Union of India*** reported in **(2017) 3 SCC 133**, to contend that where the Detention Order is passed against the detainee on different grounds which are independent of each other, the detention would survive even if one of the grounds is found to be non-existent or legally

unsustainable. It is further contended that the minor or clerical discrepancies in an Order of Detention will not invalidate the order, if the order is sustainable in all other respects.

23. In support of the said contentions, the learned SPP-1 would rely on the decisions of the Apex Court in ***Kamrunnisa Badrunnisa Sithya Aysha v. Union of India*** reported in ***(1991) 1 SCC 128, Union of India v. Mohammed Ahmed Ibrahim*** reported in ***1993 Supp (1) SCC 405*** and the decision of this Court in ***Vijaya v. Commissioner of Police and Others*** reported in ***2018 SCC OnLine Kar 3200***.

24. It is contended that if the mistake was of a trivial nature, which would, in no way interfere with the right of the detinue to make a representation as against the proposed detention, then, the order cannot be set at naught on that ground alone.

25. We notice that the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has contended that there is no Crime

No.280/2024 registered by the Andersonpet Police Station and that the reliance of the said crime is a clear mistake. However, serial No.5 in the list of criminal cases mentioned in the Order of Detention specifically states that Crime No.280/2024 of Andersonpet Police Station refers to proceedings under Section 129(e) and 129(g) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ('BNSS' for short) and states that the detainee has been bound over by an order passed under Section 129 of the BNSS by executing a bail bond for his good behaviour. Therefore, it is clear that the number mentioned at serial No.5 does not refer to a crime at all but to an order passed under Section 129 of the BNSS by the Executive Magistrate, as is stated in the Order of Detention. In the circumstances, we are unable to accept the contention of the writ petitioner that the Detention Order is bad for reliance on a non-existing crime.

26. Having considered the contentions advanced on either side, we are of the opinion that the grounds raised in the writ petition and during the course of the arguments are not tenable. The challenge raised against the Order of

Detention therefore fails. Accordingly, the Writ Petition (Habeas Corpus) is ***dismissed***.

All pending interlocutory applications shall stand *disposed of*.

**Sd/-
(ANU SIVARAMAN)
JUDGE**

**Sd/-
(TARA VITASTA GANJU)
JUDGE**

cp*