



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 11.12.2017

CORAM:

WEB COPY

**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE R. SUBBIAH**  
**AND**  
**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.D. JAGADISH CHANDIRA**

H.C.P. (MD) No.1221 of 2017

Ashokkumar : Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.State of Tamil Nadu rep. by  
The Principal Secretary to Government,  
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,  
Fort St. George, Chennai - 600 009.
  - 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate  
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate  
Thanjavur District, Thanjavur.
  - 3.The Superintendent,  
Central Prison,  
Tiruchirappalli.
- : Respondents

PRAYER: Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issue of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the entire records in detention order passed in P.D.No.23/2017 dated 04.08.2017 on the file of the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent herein and set aside the same as illegal and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner namely, Ashokkumar, S/o.Seetharaman, male, aged 33 years, who is detained in Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.A.S.Prabhu

For Respondents : Mr.C.Ramesh

Additional Public Prosecutor

\*\*\*\*\*

ORDER

\*\*\*\*\*

[Order of the Court was made by R.SUBBIAH, J]

The petitioner is the detenu viz.Ashokkumar, son of Seetharaman, aged 33 years. The detenu has been detained, as per the order of the second respondent, dated 04.08.2017, under Section 2(b) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982, branding him as "Bootlegger". Challenging the same, the petitioner has come up with this Habeas Corpus Petition.



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

3. Though a number of grounds have been raised assailing the order of detention, at the time of making submission, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the Detaining Authority, while arriving at the subjective satisfaction that there is likelihood of the detenu coming out on bail, has relied upon the bail granted in a similar case registered in Crime No.330 of 2017, on the file of Kumbakonam West Police Station. Though the Detaining Authority has relied upon the bail granted in the said case, he has not furnished a copy of the bail application in CrI.MP.No.2081 of 2017 filed in the said case. Therefore, non-furnishing of the document relied on would vitiate the order of detention.

4. In this regard, the learned counsel for the petitioner has also relied upon number of judgments delivered by the Division Benches of this Court, one such case relied upon by the petitioner is H.C.P.No.2433 of 2015 in the case of Shanmugavel vs. State of Tamil Nadu, wherein, this Court, by relying upon the dictum laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in M.Ahamed Kutty vs. Union of India and another [1990(2) SCC 1], has quashed the detention order. The relevant portion from the said judgment reads as follows:

"7. Considering the facts in the instant case, the bail application and the bail order were vital materials for consideration. If those were not considered the satisfaction of the detaining authority itself would have been impaired and if those had been considered, they would be documents relied on by the detaining authority though not specifically mentioned in the annexure to the order of detention and those ought to have formed part of the documents supplied to the detenu with the grounds of detention and without them the grounds themselves could not be said to have been complete. We have, therefore, no alternative but to hold that it amounted to denial of the detenu's right to make an effective representation and that it resulted in violation of Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India rendering the continued detention of the detenu illegal and entitling the detenu to be set at liberty in this case." (Emphasis added)."

5. The said Judgment is squarely applicable to the case on hand also. Therefore, following the dictum laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, we hold that the impugned detention order is vitiated and the same is liable to be set aside.

6. Following the said decision, this Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the impugned Detention Order, passed by the second respondent, in his proceedings in P.D.No.23/2017 dated 04.08.2017,



is quashed. The detenu, namely Ashokkumar, son of Seetharaman, aged about 33, is ordered to be set at liberty forthwith, if he is not required for detention in connection with any other case.

WEB COPY

/True Copy/

Sd/-  
Assistant Registrar (Records)

Sub-Assistant Registrar

To

1. The Principal Secretary to Government,  
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,  
Fort St. George, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate  
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate  
Thanjavur District, Thanjavur.
3. The Superintendent,  
Central Prison,  
Tiruchirappalli.
4. The Joint Secretary to Government,  
Public (Law and Order),  
Fort Saint George, Chennai-9
5. The Additional Public Prosecutor,  
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,  
Madurai.

RR  
RL/6C/3P/SKN/RSK/SAR4/26/12/2017

Order made in  
H.C.P. (MD) No.1221 of 2017

Dated: 11.12.2017