

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 26.03.2015

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.JAICHANDREN
AND
THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE K.B.K.VASUKI

HCP.No.2688 of 2014

Ameetha
the detenu

Vs

... Petitioner/mother of

1.State of Tamil nadu represented by
Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai -9.

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

Prayer:- This Habeas Corpus Petition is filed, under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the relief as stated therein.

pleased to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the records relating to the detention order passed by the Second respondent pertaining to the order made in memo No.1225/BDFGISSV/2014 dated 11.9.2014 in detaining the detenu under 2(F) of Tamilnadu Act 14 of 1982 as a Goonda and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu Azarudheen son of Atham aged about 28 years who is detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Sasikumar

For Respondents : Mr.C.Emalias, APP

ORDER

This Habeas Corpus Petition is filed, by the mother of the detenu, namely, Azarudheen, aged about 28 years, son of Atham, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records, in BDFGISSV No.1225/2014 dated 11.09.2014, passed by the second Respondent, detaining the detenu, under Section 3(1) 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 14/1982) the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982, branding him as a "Goonda", in the Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai and to quash the same and to direct the Respondents to produce the body of the detenu and set him at liberty forthwith.

2. Though several grounds have been raised in this Habeas Corpus Petition, Mr.R.Sasikumar, learned counsel for the petitioner has assailed the impugned detention order only on the ground of non-supply of copy of the bail applications filed 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.C.Emalias, 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 were 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 4 of the Grounds of Detention that in similar cases, the accused were released on bail by the orders of the High Court, Madras in CrI.OP.Nos.13843/2009 and 21529/2014 in connection with R7 KK Nagar Police Station Cr.No.301/2009 registered for the offences under Sections 147, 148, 341 and 302 IPC and relating to J3 Guindy Police Station Cr.No.1096 of 2014 registered for the offences under sections 341, 323, 294 (b), 324, 307, 336, 427 and 506(ii) IPC respectively; and in CrI.MP.No.460/2013 by the V Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Egmore, Chennai in connection with K3 Aminjikarai Police Station Cr.No.164/2013 registered for the offences under Sections 384 and 506(ii) IPC. On a perusal of the Paper Book furnished by the Prosecution, it is seen that it does not contain the copy of the bail applications filed in 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 the same 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 a copy of the bail application 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 filed 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/-
Asst.Registrar (CO)

/true copy/

Sub Asst. Registrar

rk

To:

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

BR (CO)
kk 24/4

HCP.No.2688/2014



WEB COPY