

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS
DATED : 05.09.2018
CORAM
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.T.SELVAM
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR

H.C.P.No.774 of 2018

Vikram
S/o.Raja ... Petitioner
-vs-

1.State of Tamilnadu
represented by
The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai - 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Chennai. ... Respondents

Writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India filed praying for issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus directing the respondents to produce the petitioner by name Vikram S/o.Raja, aged about 24 years, before this Court, now confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, set him at liberty and to call for the records pertaining to the order of detention passed in No.64/BCDFGISSSV/2018 dated 08.02.2018 passed by the second respondent and set aside the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.S.Raman,
Senior counsel
For Respondents : Mr.M.Mohamed Riyaz
Additional Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

(The order of the Court was made by C.T.SELVAM, J)

Petitioner, who is the detenu, has been branded as a "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and detained under order of the second respondent passed in No.64/BCDFGISSSV/2018 dated 08.02.2018.

2. The detenu came to adverse notice in the following cases:-
Sl.No.

Police Station and Crime No.

Sections of Law

1.

E.1 Mylapore Police Station,

Crime No.1258 of 2017

457 and 380 IPC

2.

E.1 Mylapore Police Station,

Crime No.1283 of 2017

379 IPC

3.

E.5 Foreshore Estate Police Station, Crime No.594 of 2017

457 and 380 IPC

4.

E.5 Foreshore Estate Police Station, Crime No.699 of 2017

379 IPC

The alleged ground case has been registered against the detenu in Crime No.700 of 2017 on the file of E.5 Foreshore Estate Police Station, for offences under Sections 341, 294(b), 336, 427, 392, 397 and 506(ii) IPC. Aggrieved by the order of detention, the present writ petition has been filed.

3. Learned senior counsel for petitioner submits that the detenu was arrested on 17.12.2017 in respect of the ground case and the order of detention came to be passed on 08.02.2018. A period of one and a half months had lapsed between the date of arrest of the detenu and the sponsoring authority recommending his detention. Such long delay stands not explained and hence, the order of detention is liable to be set aside following the order of Division Bench of this Court in Ramesh v. District Collector and District Magistrate, Tiruchirapalli District and another [2005 MLJ (Crl.) 752].

4. We have heard learned Additional Public Prosecutor on the above submissions.

5. In the decision relied upon by learned senior counsel for petitioner in Ramesh's case (cited supra), 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.....□.□

Following the principle enunciated in the above said order of the Division Bench of this Court, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the impugned detention order passed by the second respondent, detaining the detenu Vikram S/o.Raja in No.64/BCDFGISSSV/2018 dated 08.02.2018 is quashed. The above named detenu is ordered to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his custody is required in connection with any other case.

[C.T.S., J] [M.N.K., J]

05.09.2018

Index: Yes/No

Internet: Yes

gm

To

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

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Chennai.

3.The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Chennai.

4.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai.

C.T.SELVAM, J
and
M.NIRMAL KUMAR, J

gm

H.C.P.No.774 of 2018

05.09.2018