

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 22.10.2018

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.T.SELVAM
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR

H.C.P. No.1145 of 2018

S.Soundaraya

... Petitioner

-Vs-

1. The Principal Secretary to the Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai-600 009.

2. The Commissioner of Police,
Salem.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating to the order of detention C.M.P.NO.22/GOODA/SALEM CITY/2018 dated, 15/05/2018 passed by the 2nd respondent and to quash the same and also to direct the detenu Valuppan Karthi @ Sriramkarthi, S/O.Subramani, who is presently detained in the Central Prison, Salem to be produced before this Hon'ble court and set at liberty.

For Petitioner :Mr.B.Manimaran

For Respondents:Mr.M.Mohamed Riyaz
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Order of the Court made by C.T.SELVAM, J.]

Petitioner, who is the wife of the detenu, viz., Valuppan Karthi @ Sriramkarthi, Son of Subramani, aged 25 years, challenges the impugned order of detention, dated 15.05.2018 in C.M.P.No.22/Goonda/Salem City/2018 detaining her husband as "GOONDA", as contemplated under Section 2(f) of the Tamil Nadu Prevention of dangerous activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Slum-grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 (Tamil Nadu Act 14/1982).

2. The detenu has come to adverse notice in the following cases:-

S.No	Cr.No. & Police Station	Offences
1.	Cr.No.121/2016 Kannankurichi Police Station	3(i) of Tamil Nadu Property (Prevention of Damage and Loss) Act, 1992 @ into 147, 148 IPC r/w 3(i) of Tamil Nadu Property (Prevention of Damage and Loss) Act, 1992
2.	Cr.No.166/2018 Kannankurichi Police Station	454 & 380 IPC
3.	Cr.No.170/2018 Kannankurichi Police Station	454 & 380 IPC

The ground case has been registered against the detenu in Cr.No.287/2018 on the file of Inspector of Police, Kannankurichi Police Station, for offences u/s 392 r/w 397, 506(ii) IPC. The detention order has been passed by first respondent in No.C.M.P.No.22/Goonda/Salem City/2018.

3. We have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents. We have perused the counter affidavit as also the records produced by the Detaining Authority.

4. Though several grounds have been raised in the Habeas Corpus Petition, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, confines his argument only in respect of non-application of mind on the part of the detaining authority in passing the order of detention.

5. A perusal of the Grounds of Detention would reveal that a ground case came to be registered against the detenu in Cr.No.287/2018 for the offences u/s. 392 r/w 397, 506(ii) IPC. Admittedly, the bail application filed by the detenu in the ground case before the learned Vacation Sessions Judge, Salem, in CMP.1536/2018 and the same was dismissed on 09.05.2018. Therefore, the likelihood of coming out on bail is very remote ; whereas the statement of the Sponsoring Authority has been taken into consideration by the Detaining Authority that the relatives of the detenu are taking steps to file bail applications in the ground case. When a bail application has not been moved, the logical conclusion would be that there is no likelihood of coming out on bail. Therefore, we are of the view that the finding of the Detaining Authority that there is likelihood of the detenu coming out on bail, is nothing but a clear non-application of mind and the Detaining Authority has not passed the order on merits ; but passed, based on mere ipsi dixit. Though the

detaining authority has made reliance on similar case, in which an accused was granted bail, the facts involved in those cases are different. The principle of similarity cannot be applied mechanically. Normally, bails are granted based on the facts and circumstances of each case. Therefore, similar case plea, cannot be taken into consideration. Hence, there is no material to substantiate that there is real possibility of the detenu coming out on bail and the said order was passed without application of mind. Hence, on this ground, the detention order is liable to be set aside.

6. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention passed by the 2nd respondent is set aside. The detenu is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.
Kmi

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS IX)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

To:

1. The Principal Secretary to the Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police, Salem.
3. The Superintendent, Central Prison,
Salem.
- 4.The Joint Secretary,
Public (Law and order) Department,
Secretariat, Chennai -600 009.
- 5.The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras.

+ 1 cc to Mr.B.Manimaran, Advocate Sr 72718

KR/14/11/18

H.C.P.No.1145 of 2018