



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 12.01.2017

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.SUBBIAH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE J.NISHA BANU

H.C.P.(MD)No.1088 of 2016

N.Muthuraj alias Andavar : Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by its Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tirunelveli District,
Tirunelveli.
- 3.The Inspector of Police,
Alangulam Police Station,
Tirunelveli District. : 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 records relating to the Detention Order passed by the second respondent in No.in M.H.S.Confdl.No.38/2016, dated 26.03.2016 and to quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner/detenu, namely N.Muthuraj alias Andavar, S/o.Nainar Thevar, aged 32 years, before this Court and set at liberty, now detained at Central Prison, Palayamkottai.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Saravanan


For Respondents : Mr.C.Mayilvahana Rajendran,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the detenu - Muthuraj alias Andavar, S/o.Nainar Thevar, aged about 32 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in M.H.S.Confdl.No.38/2016, dated 26.03.2016, holding him to be a "Goonda", as contemplated under Section 2(f) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982.

2. Though the detention order is sought to be assailed on several grounds, the learned counsel for the petitioner mainly relies on the contention 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 by this Court to one Ayan alias Nirmal, in CrI.O.P.(MD)No.2575 of 2014, relating to the case registered in Crime No.568 of 2013, on



the file of Alangulam Police Station, for offences under Sections 147, 148, 447, 294(b), 302, 506(ii) r/w 120(B) IPC. Though the Detaining Authority has relied upon the bail granted in the said case, he has not furnished a copy of the bail application filed in the said case. Therefore, non-furnishing of the document relied on would vitiate the order of detention.

3. 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)."

4. 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.

5. In the result, this Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the impugned Detention Order, passed by the second respondent, in his proceedings in M.H.S.Confdl.No.38/2016, dated 26.03.2016, is quashed. The detenu, namely Muthuraj alias Andavar, S/o.Nainar Thevar, aged about 32 years, is ordered to be set at liberty forthwith, if he is not required for detention in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(RTI)



To

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by its Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tirunelveli District,
Tirunelveli.
3. The Superintendent of Central Prison,
Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli District.
4. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law & Order),
Fort Saint George, Chennai-9.
5. Commissioner of Police,
Tirunelveli.
6. Director General of Police,
Chennai.
7. The Inspector of Police,
Alangulam Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.
8. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

+1cc to Mr.A.Saravanan, Advocate, Sr.No. 2917

SML

AE/MR VB/30.01.2017/3p/10c

Order made in
H.C.P. (MD) No.1088 of 2016
Dated: 12.01.2017