

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 23.09.2015

CORAM

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

H.C.P. No.1732 of 2015

Sivagamai

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Government of Tamil Nadu,
Rep.by Secretary,
Home - Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police, Chennai Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Vepery, Chennai - 600 007.

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for a Writ of Habeas Corpus, directing the detaining authority to produce the detenu Vinothkumar @ Vinoth, son of Jothi Prakash, aged about 28 years and presently a resident of No.16/27, Veerapandi Nagar 2nd Street, Choolaimedu, Chennai - 600 094, who has been detained under Act 14 of 1982 after having been declared as a "Goonda" by order of the 2nd respondent's detention order dated 02.05.2015 and presently confined at the Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai as TPDA 6567 under the preventive detention order in BCDFGISSSV No.372 of 2015 and to set aside the same and to set the detenu at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Shiv Kumar

For Respondents : Mr.M.Maharaja,
Additional 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 Proceedings Memo No.BCDFGISSSV No.372 of 2015 dated 02.05.2015 whereby the detenu/the husband of the petitioner herein, by name, Vinothkumar @ Vinoth, son of Jothi Prakash, aged about 28 years, was ordered to be detained under the provisions of the Tamilnadu 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 [Tamilnadu Act 14 of 1982] branding him as a "GOONDA".

2. Though many grounds have been raised in the petition, Mr.A.Shiv Kumar, 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 case, the accused was released on bail by the learned Principal Sessions Judge, Chennai in CrI.M.P.No.11856 of 2014 in respect of the case in Crime No.956 of 2014 for the offences under Sections 341, 294[b], 323, 384, 307 and 506[ii] IPC on the file of D-2 Anna Salai Police Station, Chennai. 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 and only the respective bail orders were furnished to the detenu in page Nos.145 to 148 [in English version and in Vernacular version] in the Booklet placed before us. The said bail application filed in similar case was the document 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 cases to the detenu would vitiate the impugned detention order.

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.

सत्यमेव जयते

-sd/-

ASSISTANT REGISTRAR (Records)

/ TRUE COPY /

WEB COPY

SUB-ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

sri

To

- 1.The Secretary, Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home - Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police, Chennai Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Vepery, Chennai - 600 007.
- 3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.
4. The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.
5. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (law & order),
Fort St.George, Chennai 600 009.

CO-AK
JD 09/10/2015

H.C.P. No.1732 of 2015



WEB COPY