

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD****SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 2092 of 2013****FOR APPROVAL AND SIGNATURE:****HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.J.DESAI      sd/-**

- =====
- |   |   |    |
|---|---|----|
| 1 | Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?  | No |
| 2 | To be referred to the Reporter or not ?   | No |
| 3 | Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgment ?   | No |
| 4 | Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the constitution of India, 1950 or any order made thereunder ? | No |
| 5 | Whether it is to be circulated to the civil judge ?   | No |
- =====

=====

SANJAYKHAN MUNSIKHAN TAILI....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF GUJARAT & 2....Respondents

=====

Appearance:

MR ATIT THAKORE FOR MR AR SHAIKH, ADVOCATE for the Petitioner.

MR NIRAJ ASHAR, AGP for the Respondent No.3.

RULE SERVED BY DS for the Respondent Nos.1 – 2.

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.J.DESAI**

**Date : 28/02/2013**

**ORAL JUDGMENT**

[1]            This petition is directed against the order of

detention dated 19/11/2012 passed by respondent No.2 herein - District Magistrate, Banaskantha, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 3(1) of the Gujarat Prevention of Anti Social Activities Act, 1985 (in short "the PASA Act") by detaining the detinue as a "bootlegger" as defined under Section 2(b) of the Act. Along with the order of detention, the detinue is also served with the grounds of detention. In the grounds of detention, there is a reference to one criminal case pending against the detinue. The case is registered under the provisions of the Bombay Prohibition Act.

[2] Mr.Atit Thakore, learned advocate for the detinue submits that registration of FIR itself cannot lead to disturbance of even tempo of public life and therefore the public order. The order of detention is assailed by the detinue on various grounds mentioned in the memo of the petition. However, learned counsel for the detinue submits that, except FIR registered under the Bombay Prohibition Act, there was no other material before the detaining authority whereby it could be inferred reasonably that the detinue is a 'bootlegger' within the meaning of Section 2(b) of the Act and required to be detained as the detinue's activities are prejudicial to the maintenance of public health and public order. In support of the above submission, learned counsel

for the detainee has placed reliance on judgment of the Apex Court in the case of **Piyush Kantilal Mehta vs. Commissioner of police, AIR 1989 Supreme Court 491** and the recent judgment dated 28.3.2011 passed by the Division Bench of this Court [Coram: S.J. Mukhopadhaya C.J. & J.B. Pardiwala, JJ.] in **Letters Patent Appeal No2732 of 2010 in Special Civil Application No.9492 of 2010 (Aartiben vs. Commissioner of Police)** which would squarely help the detainee.

[3] Mr.Niraj Ashar, learned Assistant Government Pleader submitted that registration of FIR would go to show that the detainee had, in fact, indulged into such activities, which can be said to be disturbing the public health and public order and in view of sufficient material before the detaining authority to pass the order of detention, no interference is called for by this Court in exercise of its power under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

[4] Having heard the rival submissions of the parties and perused the record of the case, I am of the view that FIR registered under the Bombay Prohibition Act alone cannot be said to be sufficient enough to arrive at subjective satisfaction to the effect that the activities, as alleged, are prejudicial to

the public order or lead to disturbance of public order. There has to be nexus and link for such activities with disturbance of the public order. On careful perusal of the material available on record and the ratio laid down by the Apex Court in the case of **Piyush Kantilal Mehta (supra)** and the recent judgment dated 28.3.2011 passed by the Division Bench of this Court [Coram: S.J. Mukhopadhaya C.J. & J.B. Pardiwala, J].] **in Letters Patent Appeal No2732 of 2010 in Special Civil Application No.9492 of 2010 (Aartiben vs. Commissioner of Police)**, I am of the view that the activities of the detinue cannot be said to be in any manner prejudicial to the public order and therefore, the order of detention passed by the detaining authority cannot be sustained and is required to be quashed and set aside.

[5] In the result, the petition is allowed. The impugned order of detention dated 19/11/2012 passed by respondent No.2 herein, is hereby quashed and set aside. The detinue is ordered to be set at liberty forthwith if he is not required to be detained in connection with any other case. Rule is made absolute accordingly.

Direct service is permitted.

sd/-  
**[A.J. DESAI, J.]**

\*dipti