

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 21.07.2015

CORAM

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

H.C.P.No.699 of 2015

Archana

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1. The State of Tamilnadu, rep. By its
Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Chennai Police,
Chennai - 600 008.

... Respondents

Prayer : Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ of habeas corpus calling for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the 2nd respondent dated 21.02.2015 in Memo No.168/BCDFGISSSV/2015 against the petitioner's husband, Madhan @ Madhanraj, S/o Kartheesan, aged 28 years, who is confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.C.Chellappan

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 in Memo No.168/BCDFGISSSV/2015 dated 21.02.2015, whereby the detenu/the husband of the petitioner herein, by name, Madhan @ Madhanraj, S/o Kartheesan, aged 28 year, 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 several grounds have been raised in this Habeas Corpus Petition, Mr.C.C.Chellappan, the learned counsel for the petitioner has assailed the impugned detention order only on the ground of non-supply of copy of the bail applications in 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 copy of the bail applications in 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 were released on bail by the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Tambaram in CrI.M.P.No.17907/2013 in Crime No.1340/2013 on the file of S11, Tambaram Police Station for the offence under sections 341, 336, 427, 392 and 506(ii) IPC and by the learned XVII Metropolitan Magistrate, in CrI.M.P.No.593/2009 in Crime No.26/2009 on the file of R1 Mambalam Police Station for the offence under sections 379 IPC. On a perusal of the Paper Book furnished by the Prosecution, it is seen from page No.303 to 362 that only the bail order copy of similar cases were furnished in respect of Cr.Nos.1340/2013 and 26/2009 respectively and it does not contain the copy of the bail applications in similar cases. The said bail applications filed in similar cases were 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 a document has 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 applications 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 or detention.

8. As already analysed by us, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, non-supply of the copy of the bail applications in similar cases, 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 of the second respondent dated 21.02.2015, is set aside. The detenu is directed to be released forthwith, unless his presence is required in connection with any other case.

WEB COPY

Sd/-
Asst.Registrar (CS V)

/true copy/


Sub Asst. Registrar

To

1. The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Chennai Police,
Chennai - 600 008.
3. The Superintendent of Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai.
4. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.
5. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law & Order) Department,
Fort. st. Georg,
Chennai-9

H.C.P.No.699 of 2015

eu[col
srg 07.08.2015



WEB COPY