

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED 02.09.2015

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE DR.JUSTICE S.TAMILVANAN  
AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.T.SELVAM

H.C.P.No.1315/2015

U.Geetha

..

Petitioner

Vs

The State represented by its  
1.The Secretary to Government (Home),  
Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Government of Tamil Nadu,  
Fort St. George, Chennai - 9.

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

..

Respondents

Prayer:- This Habeas Corpus Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records pertaining to the order of detention dated 21.04.2015 passed by the second respondent in Memo No.330/BCDFGISSSV/2015 and quash the same and produce the detenu, Udaya @ Udayaraj aged about 26 years, S/o.Kutty before this Court and set him at liberty detenu now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Manoharan

For Respondents : Mr.M.Maharaja,  
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

Challenge is made to the order of detention passed by the second respondent vide Proceedings in Memo No.330/BCDFGISSSV/2015 dated 21.04.2015, whereby the detenu, by name, Udaya @ Udayaraj, son of Kutty, aged 26 years, was ordered to be detained under the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand 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, the learned counsel for the petitioner has assailed the impugned detention order only on the ground of non-supply of copy of the bail application in similar case, 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 copy of the bail application in similar case, 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, viz., [a] the accused was released on bail by the learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai in CrI.MP.No.460/2013 in respect of the case in Crime No.164/2013 for the offences u/s.384 and 506(ii) IPC on the file of the K3 Aminjikarai Police Station and [b] the accused was released on bail by the learned Principal Sessions Judge, Chennai in CrI.MP.No.10992/2011 in respect of the case in Crime No.1640/2011 for the offences under Sections 294(b), 341, 336, 307, 397 and 506(ii) IPC on the file of the V5 Thirumangalam Police Station respectively. On a perusal of the Paper Book furnished by the Prosecution, it is seen that it does not contain the copy of the said bail application in similar case ; but only the bail order of the said similar case [both in English and in vernacular version] has been furnished in page Nos.445 to 449 of the Booklet. The said bail application filed in similar case 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, non supply of the copy of the bail application in similar case to the detenu would vitiate the impugned detention order. This order is made only towards setting aside the order of detention passed against the detenu herein. Any bail applications moved by the detenu in the ground case or in the adverse cases, necessarily would have to be considered by the Court concerned solely on merits uninfluenced by the order of this Court.

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 application 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 of detention.

8.As already analysed by us, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, non-supply of the copy of the bail application in similar case, to the detenu has the effect of vitiating the impugned detention order. Further, due to non-supply of such a vital document, 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.

-s/d-  
Assistant Registrar

True Copy

Sub-Assistant Registrar

To

1.The Secretary to Government (Home),  
Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Government of Tamil Nadu,  
Fort St. George, Chennai - 9.

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

3.THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,  
HIGH COURT, CHENNAI.

4.The Superintendent of Central Prison,  
Puzhal, Chennai.

5.The Joint Secretary to Government,  
Public Law and order Fort St.George,  
Chennai-9

HCP.No.1315/2015

aa29/09/2015



WEB COPY