

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED 14.03.2017

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.NAGAMUTHU
and
THE HONOURABLE DR.JUSTICE ANITA SUMANTH

H.C.P No.1718 of 2016

G. KarthiKeyan (deceased)
G. Sivaraman
(substituted as per order dated
07.03.2017 in CrI.M.P.No.3611/2017) ..Petitioner/Husband
of the detainee

Vs

1. State of Tamil Nadu
rep by its Secretary to Government,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai-600 009
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Vepery, Chennai ..Respondents/Respondents

Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ, order or Direction in the nature of a Writ of Habeas Corpus or any other appropriate writ or direction calling upon the production of the records relating to the detention order dated 15.07.2016 made in detention order Memo NO.704/BCDFGISSSV/2016 passed by the 2nd respondent herein quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of Tmt.Fargana, Female, W/o Karthikeyan(deceased) aged about 29 years branded as Goonda and now confined in Special Prison for Women, Puzhal, Chennai before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr. R. Nalliyappan
For respondents: Mr.V.M.R. Rajendran
Addl. Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner, who is the brother-in-law of the detenu Tmt.Fargana, Female, W/o Karthikeyan(deceased) aged about 29 years has come up with this habeas corpus petition, challenging the detention order passed against Tmt.Fargana by the second respondent, in Memo NO.704/BCDFGISSSV/2016 dated 15.07.2016.

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

3. Though, several grounds were raised in the petition, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would mainly focus on the ground that though there was no bail application pending in Crime Nos.30 of 2016 and 309/2016, the detaining authority has stated that the relatives of the detenu were taking steps to file bail application, in which case there was real possibility of the detenu coming out on bail. The learned counsel pointed out that to arrive at such a conclusion, there was no material placed before the detaining authority at all.

4. The learned Additional Public prosecutor would submit that in the Special report submitted by the Inspector of Police, there is a statement to the effect that the relatives of the detenu were taking steps to file bail application seeking bail in connection with the case in Crime Nos.30/2016 and 309/2016.

5. We have considered the above submissions. Admittedly, as on the date of passing of the detention order, there was no application filed by the detenu seeking bail in Crime Nos.30 of 2016 and 309/2016, on the file of R-4, Soondarapandiyanur Angadi Police Station. Though it is alleged that his relatives were taking steps to file an application for bail, there were no materials available before the detaining authority, except the report of the Inspector of Police. Even the report of the Inspector of Police does not spell out as to how he came to know that the relatives were taking steps to file application seeking bail. Full details as to who are those relatives, who were taking steps to file bail application also have not been mentioned. Thus, in our considered view, without making proper application of mind relating to these facts, the detaining authority has passed the detention order. Therefore, we are inclined to set aside the same.

6. Accordingly, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the impugned detention order, dated 15.07.2016, 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.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(J)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

sr

To

1. The Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai-600 009
 2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Vepery, Chennai
 3. The Supertendent, Special Prison for Women,
Puzhal, Chennai.
 4. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public(Law & Order),
Fort Saint George, Chennai - 9.
 5. The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Chennai.
- + 1 cc to Mr.R. Nalliappan, Advocate Sr.15875

H.C.P.No.1718 of 2016

NMI (CO)
EU 4.4.17



WEB COPY