

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 29.01.2018

CORAM:

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

H.C.P. No.2399 of 2017

Pachaiyammal

... Petitioner/Mother of
the Detenu

-Vs-

1. The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St George, Chennai 600 009.
2. Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai.

... 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 No.219/BCDFGISSSV/2017 dated, 29/04/2017 passed by the 2nd respondent and to quash the same and also to direct the detenu Thiru.Mani @ Annadurai, S/o.Subramani, who is presently detained in the Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai to be produced before this Hon'ble court and set at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Senthilvel

For Respondents: Mr.M.R.Rajentran
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner, who is the mother of the detenu, namely, Mani @ Annadurai, son of Subramani, age 24 years, challenges the impugned order of detention, dated 29.04.2017 in No.219/BCDFGISSSV/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 08.04.2017; whereas the Detention order was passed on 29.04.2017, i.e., after a lapse of 21 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 4 adverse cases have been registered against the detenu and a ground case was registered against him in Cr.No.676/2017 for the offences u/s.341, 294[b], 323, 336, 397 and 506[ii] IPC. Admittedly, bail application moved by the detenu in Crl.M.P.No.6928 of 2017 was pending on the date of passing the Detention Order. 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. Further, the Detaining Authority referred Crl.M.P.Nos.1252 of 2017 and 1270 of 2017, but the bail application copies have not been furnished in the typed set of

papers. It is to be noted that the detenu was arrested in the ground case in Cr.No.676/2017 on 08.04.2017, whereas the detention order was passed on 29.04.2017, i.e. after a lapse of 21 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 No.219/BCDFGISSSV/2017 dated 29.04.2017, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Mani @ Annadurai, son of Subramani, aged about 24 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

s/d-
Assistant Registrar(CO)

True Copy

Sub-Assistant Registrar

kmi

To:

1. The Secretary to Government [Home]
Prohibition and Excise Department,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Fort St George, Chennai 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police
Greater Chennai, Vepery,
Chennai 600007.
3. The Superintendent, Central Prison
Puzhal, Chennai.
4. The Joint Secretary to Government
Public (Law and order)
Fort. St. George
Chennai 9.
5. The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.

WEB COPY

H.C.P.No.2399 of 2017

VGII(CO)
SP(23/02/2018)