

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED 12.04.2017

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.NAGAMUTHU

and

THE HONOURABLE DR.JUSTICE ANITA SUMANTH

H.C.P No.2495 of 2016

Krishnan
...Petitioner

Vs

1. State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. By the Secretary,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai – 600 009
2. The District Magistrate and
District Collector,
Dharmapuri District,
Dharmapuri.

....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 produce the body of the petitioner's son Raja @ Kumar, S/o Krishnan, who is detained in Central Prison, Salem before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith by calling for the records pursuant to the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 28.08.2016 in S.C.No.18/2016 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.B.Kumarasamy

For respondents : Mr.V.M.R. Rajentren,

Addl. Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner has come up with this Habeas Corpus Petition, challenging the detention order passed against the petitioner's son Raja @ Kumar, S/o Krishnan, by the second respondent, vide proceedings S.C.No.18/2016 dated 28.08.2016.

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 bail application filed in CrI M.P.No.1346/2016 dated 11-08-2016 was dismissed on 16.08.2016 and the detaining authority has stated that the relatives of the detenu were taking steps to file bail application in the above case, 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 CrI M.P.No.1346/2016 dated 11-08-2016 .

5. We have considered the above submissions. Admittedly, as on the date of passing of the detention order, bail application filed by the detenu seeking bail in CrI M.P.No.1346/2016 dated 11-08-2016 was dismissed on 16.08.2016. 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 28.08.2016, 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.,)
12-04-2017

Speaking Order/ Non-Speaking Order

Index : Yes/no

Internet : Yes/no

sts

To

1. The Secretary,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai – 600 009
2. The District Magistrate and
District Collector,
Dharmapuri District,
Dharmapuri.
3. The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Chennai.

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

Order in
H.C.P.No.2495 of 2016

12-04-2017
<http://www.judis.nic.in>