

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED 24.04.2017

CORAM

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

H.C.P No.2261 of 2016

R. Rathika,
W/o. Raja,
K. Nagar, Kethapetta, Tharka (way),
Vengatapuram (post) Krishnagiri (tk)....Petitioner

Vs

1. State of Tamil Nadu
rep by The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise (Home) Department,
Chennai - 600 009
2. The District Collector and
Judicial Magistrate, Krishnagiri,
Krishnagiri District.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, calling for the records relating to the order of detention passed by the 2nd respondent herein in his Memo.No. S.C.No.29 of 2016 dated on 15.09.2016 and to quash the same and also to direct the detenu Raja, S/o. Govindan, aged about 36 years who is now detained in Central Prison, Salem before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr. V. Veluchamy
For respondents : Mr.V.M.R. Rajentren
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner, who is the wife of the detenu Raja, S/o Govindan, aged about 36 years, has come up with this Habeas Corpus Petition, challenging the detention order passed against the detenu Raja, by the second respondent, vide proceedings

S.C. No.29 of 2016 dated 15.09.2016

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.366/2016 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.366/2016.

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.366/2016 on the file of Shoolagiri 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 15.09.2016 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/d-

Assistant Registrar(CS-VIII)

True Copy


Sub-Assistant Registrar

To

1. The Secretary to the Government,
The State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Chennai - 600 009
2. The District Collector and
Judicial Magistrate, Krishnagiri,
Krishnagiri District.
3. The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Chennai.
4. The Superintendent
Central Prison
Salem
5. The Joint Secretary to Govt
Public(law & Order)
Fort.St. George
Chennai 9

RK(CO)
sp/11/5

H.C.P.No.2261 of 2016



WEB COPY