

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS
DATED:12.02.2018

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.T.SELVAM
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

H.C.P. No.2106 of 2017

Manjula

... Petitioner

-Vs-

1.The Commissioner of Police,
Chennai Police,
The Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Vepery, Chennai-600 007.

2.The Government of Tamilnadu,
Rep.by its Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St., George, Chennai-600 009.

... 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 BCDFGISSSV NO.637/2017 dated, 14/10/2017 passed by the 1st respondent and to quash the same and also to direct the respondents to produce the detenu Thiru.Rajkumar @ Gold Rajkumar, S/O.Elumalai, who is presently detained in the Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this Hon'ble court and set at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Mohanraj

For Respondents: Mr.V.M.R.Rajentran, APP

ORDER

[Order of the Court by N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.]

The petitioner, who is the mother of the detenu, namely, Rajkumar @ Gold Rajkumar, son of Elumalai, age 23 years, challenges the impugned order of detention, dated 14.10.2017 in BCDFGISSSV No.637/2017 detaining her son as "Goonda", as contemplated under Section 2(f) of the Tamil Nadu Prevention of dangerous activities of Boot leggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Slum-grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 (Tamil Nadu Act 14/1982).

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 produced by the Detaining Authority.

3. 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. Further, the detenu was arrested in the ground case on 11.09.2017; whereas the Detention order was passed on 14.10.2017, i.e., after a lapse of 33 days. This inordinate delay in passing of detention order would vitiate the same. In support of his contention, learned counsel for the petitioner placed reliance on the judgment of a Division Bench of this Court reported in 2005 MLJ (Crl.) 752 (Ramesh v. District Collector and District Magistrate, Tiruchirapalli District and another). Hence, on the above grounds, the detention order is liable to be set aside.

4. A perusal of the Grounds of Detention would reveal that 3 adverse cases have been registered against the detenu and a ground case was registered against him in Cr.No.1608/2017 for the offences u/s.294(b), 323, 336, 397 and 506(ii) IPC. Admittedly, bail application moved by the detenu in Crime No.1577 of 2017 in Crl.M.P.No.14899 of 2017 and the same was dismissed by the learned Principal Sessions Judge, Chennai and he has not moved any bail application. 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 adverse cases. 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. It is to be noted that the detenu was arrested in the ground case in Cr.No.1608/2017 on 11.09.2017, whereas the detention order was

passed on 14.10.2017, i.e. after a lapse of 33 days. This inordinate delay in passing of detention order would vitiate the same. Learned counsel for the petitioner has rightly placed reliance on the decision in Ramesh's case (cited supra) wherein this Court has held as follows:-

"....

3. It is brought to our notice by the learned Government advocate that the analyst report was received on 06.12.2014 and the doctor has issued certificate on 07.12.2014. Even in the counter affidavit filed by the first respondent, it is stated that the sponsoring authority has submitted his affidavit only on 15.01.2015. When the sponsoring authority is in possession of the analyst report and the doctor's report even on 06.12.2014 and 07.12.2014, there is no proper explanation for submitting his affidavit till 15.01.2015 for invoking the provisions of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. Even thereafter, the impugned detention order was passed only on 27.02.2015, i.e. After five weeks of receipt of the affidavit from the sponsoring authority. Though the detaining authority has filed a counter affidavit, there is no explanation for the undue delay in passing the impugned order.

4. In this regard, learned counsel for the petitioner relied on unreported decision of this Court rendered in H.C.P. No.1149 of 1995, dated 13.12.1995. In similar circumstances, after pointing out the unexplained delay between the date of submission of the affidavit by the sponsoring authority and the detention order, the Division Bench of this Court has concluded thus:

"Such delays tend to have an affect of snapping the link between prejudicial activity and passing of preventive orders....."

5. In view of the above decision rendered by the Division Bench of this Court, this Court is of the view that the detention order is unsustainable in law on the ground of inordinate and unexplained delay in passing the detention order and the same is liable to be set aside.

6. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in BCDFGISSSV No.637/2017 dated 14.10.2017, passed by the first respondent is set aside.

The detenu, namely, Rajkumar @ Gold Rajkumar, son of Elumalai, aged about 23 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS VII)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

kmi

To:

- 1.The Commissioner of Police,
Chennai Police,
The Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Vepery, Chennai-600 007.
- 2.The Secretary to the Govt.,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.
- 3.The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.
- 4.The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law & Order)
Fort St. George,
Chennai-9.
- 5.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai.

NRI (CO)
sm:6.3.2018

WEB COPY

H.C.P.No.2106 of 2017