



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 31.03.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.PONGIAPPAN

Crl.M.P.No.1765 of 2022

in Crl.R.C.No.183 of 2022

Angappan @ Ramkumar

...

Petitioner

versus

1.The Executive Magistrate-cum-
the Deputy Commissioner of Police,
Washermenpet District.

2.State By,
The Inspector of Police (Law & Order),
H8 - Thiruvottiyur Police Station,
Chennai District.
(Serial No.98 of 2021)

...

Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Miscellaneous Petition has been filed under Section 397(1) of Cr.P.C., praying to suspend the sentence of imprisonment imposed on the petitioner in the detention order passed against the petitioner in the proceedings dated 30.12.2021 in M.P.No.78 of 2021 in LIR No.464/Sec.Pro/DCP WPT/2021, on the file of the 1st respondent and enlarge the petitioner on bail, pending disposal of this Petition.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Silambu Selvan

For Respondents : Mr.Leonard Arul Joseph Selvam
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

O R D E R

This Criminal Miscellaneous Petition has been filed by the petitioner, seeking suspension of sentence imposed upon him, by the first respondent in the detention order dated 30.12.2021 in M.P.No.78 of 2021 in LIR No.464/Sec.Pro/DCP WPT/2021 and to enlarge him on bail.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner had involved in cases registered in Crime No.562 of 2019 for the offences punishable under Sections 341,294(b),




323, 324 and 506(ii) of IPC; Crime No.972 of 2019 for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 294(b), 324 and 506(ii) of IPC; and Crime No.1119 of 2019 for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 294(b), 336, 427, 392 and 506(ii) of IPC and subsequently, he was enlarged on bail. Thereafter, the petitioner had executed a bond under Section 110 Cr.P.C. for keeping good behaviour on 28.09.2021, whereas on 26.10.2021, he was falsely implicated by the second respondent in a case registered in Crime No.3130 of 2021 for the offences punishable under Sections 294(b), 384, 297 and 506(ii) of IPC and remanded to judicial custody. Thereafter, the second respondent recommended the first respondent to take action as against the petitioner. Based on the report filed by the second respondent, the petitioner was produced before the first respondent on 30.12.2021 and without affording sufficient opportunity to defend his case, he has been clamped with the detention order directing him to be in prison for a period of 337 days.

3. He would further submit that this Court, earlier, in the case of P.Sathish Vs State and another, in Crl.R.C.(MD) No.302 of 2017 dated 09.08.2017 had issued certain directions to be followed by the Executive Magistrate before clamping detention orders. Further, in the judgment rendered in Devi Vs State, in Crl.R.C.No.78 of 2020, by order dated 25.09.2020, another Hon'ble Judge of this Court had doubted the power of the Deputy Commissioner of Police in passing detention order and while deferring with the view taken in P.Sathish Vs State and another, cited supra had referred the issues to the Hon'ble Chief Justice for constituting a larger bench and thereby, it would take some time to decide the issue. He would therefore, pray for suspension of sentence pending revision.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent police would submit that the petitioner had furnished a bond to be of good behaviour on 28.09.2021. On violation of the bond, he had involved in the offence on 26.10.2021. The petitioner had previous cases before the execution of the bond, had involved himself in a subsequent case registered in Crime No.3130 of 2021 for the offences punishable under Sections 294(b), 384, 297 and 506(ii) of IPC. The first respondent after affording sufficient opportunity, finding violation of the bond, passed the order of detention.

5. Heard the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the materials on record.

6. This Court in "Devi Versus The Executive Magistrate-cum-Deputy Commissioner of Police, St.Thomas Mount District" in Crl.R.C.No.78 of 2020, by order dated 25.09.2020, had deferred with the findings given in Crl.R.C.No.982 of 2018, dated 24.11.2018 and held in paragraph No.20 as follows:-



"42 Since this Court respectfully differs from V. Parthiban, J. on the issue of applicability of Section 122(1)(b) Cr.P.C. to a good behaviour bond under Section 110(e), the Registry is directed to place this matter before the Hon'ble Chief Justice for appropriate orders.

43 Further, as this Court is not in agreement with the view propounded by another learned single judge of this Court in Balamurugan (supra), the following question is framed with a direction to the Registry to place the same before the Hon'ble Chief Justice with a request to constitute a Bench of appropriate strength for an authoritative pronouncement:

Whether G.O.Ms.No.659, Home (Cts. VIA) Department dated 12.09.2013 and G.O. Ms.No.181, Home (Cts.VIA) Department dated 20.02.2014 violate the scheme of separation of powers and are ultra vires the proviso to Section 6 of the Tamil Nadu District Police Act, 1868 (Central Act XXIV of 1868)?"

7. Now, both the learned single Judges of this Court have referred the issues to be placed before the Hon'ble The Chief Justice for constituting a larger bench with regard to applicability of Section 122(1)(b) Cr.P.C., the power exercised by police officers can it be said to be power exercised as Executive Magistrate under the Code of Criminal Procedure and for other connected issues.

8. In view of the above and it is learnt that it would take some time for the above issues to be decided, this Court is inclined to suspend the sentence imposed on the petitioner alone, with the following conditions:-

(a) The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Thiruvottiur;

(b) The petitioner and the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impressions in the surety bonds and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhaar Cards or Bank Pass Books to ensure their identities.

(c) The petitioner shall report before the concerned respondent police daily at 10.00a.m., until further orders.

9. Hence, the Criminal Miscellaneous Petition is ordered to the extent of granting Suspension of Sentence. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, is directed to set the petitioner at liberty, if his further detention is no longer required in connection with any other case or proceedings.



10. The Criminal Miscellaneous Petition is ordered accordingly.

-sd/-

31/03/2022

This order, on being produced, be punctually observed and carried into execution by all concerned

TRUE COPY

Sub-Assistant Registrar (Statistics/C.S.)
High Court, Madras - 600 104.

TO

1 THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, THIRUVOTTIYUR

2 THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE
THIRUVALLUR (FOR INFORMATION)

3 THE EXECUTIVE MAGISTRATE CUM
THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF POLICE,
WASHERMENPET DISTRICT.

4 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE (LAW AND ORDER),
H8 THIRUVOTTIYUR POLICE STATION, CHENNAI DISTRICT

5 THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

6 THE SUPERINTENDENT, CENTRAL PRISON, PUZHAL, CHENNAI

7 THE SECTION OFFICER,
CRIMINAL SECTION, HIGH COURT, MADRAS.

C.C. to M/S.S. SILAMBUSELVAN Advocate on payment of necessary charges SR.4866

Order
in
CRL MP.1765/2022
in
CRL RC.183/2022

Date : 31/03/2022

From 7.2.2001 the Registry is issuing certified copies of the BAIL/Anti.BAIL Orders in this format

RVR 31/03/2022