

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED 10.04.2017

CORAM

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

H.C.P No.2015 of 2016

Uma

...Petitioner

Vs

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep., by its Secretary,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai – 600 009

2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Chennai

....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 to call for the records in connection with the order of detention approved by the first respondent dated 11.08.2016 in BCDFGISSSV No.886/2016 against the husband of the petitioner, detenu Vellai @ Paulraj, male, aged 60, S/o Krishna Yadav, who is confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai and to set aside the same and consequently direct the respondents to produce the detenu before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Chellappan
For respondents : Mr.V.M.R. Rajentren
Addl. Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner, who is the wife of the detenu Vellai @ Paulraj, has come up with this Habeas Corpus Petition, challenging the detention order passed against Vellai @ Paulraj by the second respondent, vide proceedings No.886/BCDFGISSSV/2016 dated 11.08.2016.

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 No.467/2016 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 No.467/2016.

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 No. 467/2016 on the file of M-2 Madhavaram 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 11.08.2016, 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.

(S.N.J.,) (A.S.M.J.,)
10-04-2017

Speaking Order/ Non-Speaking Order

Index : Yes/no

Internet : Yes/no

sts

To

1. The Secretary to Government,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai – 600 009
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Chennai
3. The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Chennai.

S.NAGAMUTHU,J.
And
DR.ANITA SUMANTH,J.,
sts

Order in
H.C.P.No.2015 of 2016

10-04-2017