

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 01.04.2016

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.JAICHANDREN
and
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S.NAGAMUTHU

H.C.P.No.2858/2015

Ramesh @ Blade Ramesh

..... Petitioner

Vs

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
rep.by its Secretary to Government (Home)
Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-9

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

.. Respondents

Prayer: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS calling for the records relating to the detention order passed in Memo No.716/BCDFGISSSV/2015, dated 10.08.2015, passed by the 2nd respondent and to quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu Ramesh @ Blade Ramesh, S/o.Sundaramurthy, now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Samuel Rajapandian

For Respondents : Mr.A.N.Thambidurai,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by M.JAICHANDREN,J]

This Habeas Corpus Petition has been filed, by the detenu, namely, Ramesh @ Blade Ramesh, aged about 35 years, son of Sundaramurthy, praying that this Court may be pleased to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records, in No.716/2015, dated 10.08.2015, passed by the 2nd 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, and to quash the same and to direct the Respondents to produce the body of the detenu and to set him at liberty, forthwith.

2. We have heard the learned counsel, appearing on behalf of the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the State and we have also perused the records, carefully.

3. Though several grounds have been raised in this Habeas Corpus Petition, Mr.S.Samuel Rajapandian, the learned counsel, appearing on behalf of the petitioner, has assailed the impugned detention order only on the ground of supply of illegible copy of First Information Report, in a similar case, registered at R-4 Soundarpandiyanar Angadi Police Station Crime No.384/2015, 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.

4. Per contra, Mr.A.N.Thambidurai, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, appearing on behalf of the respondents, 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 had submitted that the copy of the First Information Report, in a similar case, furnished to the detenu, is illegible.

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

6. It is seen from paragraph 4 of the Grounds of Detention that in a similar case, the accused was released on bail, in CrI.M.P.No.2805 of 2015, on the file of the learned Principal Sessions Court, Chennai, in Cr.No.384 of 2015, for offences under Sections 341, 392, 397, 294(b), 336, 427 and 506 (ii) of IPC. On a perusal of the Paper Book furnished by the Prosecution, it is seen that the First Information Report, in the said case, registered at R-4 Soundarpandiyanar Angadi Police Station Crime No.384/2015, furnished to the detenu, is illegible and could not be read at all. The said material filed in similar case was a document relied upon by the Detaining

Authority to come to a subjective satisfaction that the detenu was likely to be released on bail. Therefore, supply of such illegible copy of the First Information Report, in a similar case, to the detenu, would vitiate the impugned detention order.

7. As already analysed by us, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, the supply of illegible copy of the First Information Report, filed in similar case, to the detenu, has the effect of vitiating the impugned detention order. Further, due to the defect in such a vital document, the detenu has lost his valuable right to make an effective representation to the authorities concerned. Therefore, the impugned order of detention is vitiated and the same is liable to be quashed.

8. Accordingly, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the impugned detention order, dated 19.08.2015, passed by the second respondent, 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

msk

To

1. The Secretary to Government (Home)
Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-9

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

3. The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai.


4. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

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

+1 cc to Mr.S.Samuel Rajapandian Advocate sr.20751

H.C.P.No.2858/2015

aa02/05/2016



WEB COPY