

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 22.07.2015

C O R A M

THE HONOURABLE DR. JUSTICE S.TAMILVANAN
and
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE C.T.SELVAM

H.C.P.No.1214 of 2015

Santhi

... Petitioner

Vs

1.The State of Tamil Nadu
rep. by the Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise
Department, Secretariat,
Chennai - 9.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Chennai City, Chennai - 8.

3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison - 2, Puzhal,
Chennai - 66.

.... Respondents

Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the entire records from the second respondent in connection with order in BDFGISSV No.76/2015 dated 03.02.2015 and quash the same and produce the petitioner's son namely Dinesh @ Ottai Dinesh, S/o.Gnanasekaran, aged 26 years now confined in Central Prison -2, Chennai, under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Pugalenth

For Respondents: Mr.M.Maharaja
Addl. Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

(Order of the Court was made by S.Tamilvanan,J.)

Challenge is made to the order of detention passed by the second respondent vide No.76/2015, dated 03.02.2015, whereby the detenu/son of the petitioner herein, by name, Dinesh @ Ottai Dinesh, Son of Gnanasekaran, male, aged about 26 years, was ordered to be

detained under the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law Offenders, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Sexual Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 (Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982) branding him as a "GOONDA".

2. Though many grounds have been raised in the petition, Mr. P. Pugalenthi, learned counsel for the petitioner has assailed the impugned detention order only on the ground of non-supply of copies of the bail applications in the similar cases, referred to in the grounds of detention, for arriving at the subjective satisfaction that there is likelihood of the detenu coming out on bail, which has affected the constitutional right of making an effective and purposeful representation to the authorities concerned, thereby vitiating the detention.

3. Per contra, Mr. M. Maharaja, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that the impugned detention order has been passed on cogent and sufficient materials and there is no illegality or infirmity in the impugned order of detention. However, he submitted that the copies of bail applications in the similar cases, referred to in the grounds of detention was not supplied to the detenu.

4. We have given our careful and anxious consideration to the rival submissions put forward by the learned counsel on either side and thoroughly scanned through the impugned detention order and the entire materials available on record.

5. It is seen from paragraph No. 4 of the Grounds of Detention that in similar cases, the accused was granted bail by the (i) Principal Sessions Court in CrI.M.P.No.10648/2012 in respect of Crime No.1302/2012 for the offences registered under Sections 325, 452, 307 IPC on the file of F-5 Choolaimedu Police Station and (ii) XIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai in CrI.M.P.No.2997/2012 in respect of Crime No.442/2012 for the offences registered under Section 392 IPC on the file of D1 Triplicane Police Station. On a perusal of the Paper Book furnished by the Prosecution, it is seen that it does not contain any of the documents, viz., the bail applications, in respect of the similar cases. The said bail applications filed in similar cases were the documents relied upon by the Detaining Authority to come to a subjective satisfaction that the detenu was likely to be released on bail. Admittedly, such documents have not been supplied to the detenu, as it did not form part of the Paper Book furnished by the Prosecution. Therefore, the non-supply of the copies of the bail applications and other documents in similar cases to the detenu would vitiate the impugned detention order. Any bail applications moved by the detenu in the ground case or in the adverse case, necessarily would have to be considered by the Court concerned solely on merits.

6.The Honourable Supreme Court in M.Ahamed Kutty Vs. Union of India and another (1990-2-SCC-1) has observed thus:-

"7. Considering the facts in the instant case, the bail applications and the bail order were vital materials for consideration. If those were not considered the satisfaction of the detaining authority itself would have been impaired and if those had been considered, they would be documents relied on by the detaining authority though not specifically mentioned in the annexure to the order of detention and those ought to have formed part of the documents supplied to the detenu with the grounds of detention and without them the grounds themselves could not be said to have been complete. We have, therefore, no alternative but to hold that it amounted to denial of the detenu's right to make an effective representation and that it resulted in violation of Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India rendering the continued detention of the detenu illegal and entitling the detenu to be set at liberty in this case." (Emphasis added)."

7.This Court in Jarinabegam Vs. State of Tamil Nadu by Secretary to Government, Prohibition and Exercise Department, Chennai and another (2007-1-MLJ-Crl-18) relying upon the decision of the Honourable Supreme Court cited supra has held that non-supply of the copy of the bail application in similar case to the detenu has the effect of vitiating the order or detention.

8.As already analysed by us, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, non-supply of the documents, viz., bail applications in similar cases to the detenu has the effect of vitiating the impugned detention order. Further, due to non-supply of such vital documents, the detenu has lost valuable right to make an effective representation to the authorities concerned.

9.In the light of the above said principles laid down by the Honourable Supreme Court and for the reasons stated above, the impugned order of detention is vitiated and the same is liable to be quashed.

10. In the result, this Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The impugned detention order is set aside. The detenu is directed to be released forthwith, unless his presence is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

mmi

To

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise
Department, Secretariat,
Chennai - 9.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Chennai City, Chennai - 8.
- 3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison - 2, Puzhal, Chennai - 66.
4. The Joint Secretary to Government Public
(Law & order), Fort St. George, Chennai. 600 009.
- 5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Chennai.

H.C.P.No.1214 of 2015

BVR(CO)
Eu 10.08.15



WEB COPY