

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD****SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 8891 of 2015****FOR APPROVAL AND SIGNATURE:****HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE Z.K.SAIYED**

=====

1	Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?	
2	To be referred to the Reporter or not ?	
3	Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgment ?	
4	Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India or any order made thereunder ?	

=====

**RAKESH @ RAKLO DILIPSINH RATHOD....Petitioner(s)****Versus****STATE OF GUJARAT & 2....Respondent(s)**

=====

**Appearance:****MR MR PRAJAPATI, ADVOCATE for the Petitioner(s) No. 1****ADVANCE COPY SERVED TO GP/PP for the Respondent(s) No. 1****MR KM ANTANI, AGP for the Respondent(s) No. 3****RULE SERVED BY DS for the Respondent(s) No. 1 - 2**

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE Z.K.SAIYED****Date : 31/07/2015****ORAL JUDGMENT**

- 1) This petition is directed against the order of detention dated 7.5.2015 passed by respondent No.2 in exercise of powers conferred under Section 3(2) of the Gujarat Prevention of Anti Social Activities Act, 1985 (in short” the Act) by detaining the detainee as a “bootlegger” as defined under Section 2(b) of the Act.
- 2) Learned advocate for the detainee submits that registration of FIRs itself cannot lead to disturbance of even tempo of public life and therefore the public order. The order of detention is assailed by the detainee on various grounds mentioned in the memo of the petition. However, learned counsel for the detainee submits that, except FIRs registered under the Bombay Prohibition Act, there was no other material before the detaining authority whereby it could be inferred reasonably that the detenu is a 'bootlegger' within the meaning of Section 2(b) of the Act and required to be detained as the detainee'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.K. Mukhopadhyaya 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)** which would squarely help the detainee.
- 3) Learned Assistant Government Pleader submitted that registration of FIRs 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 FIRs 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.K. Mukhopadhyaya 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)**, I am of the view that the activities of the detainee 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.

In the result, this Special Civil Application is allowed. The order of detention dated 7.5.2015 is hereby quashed and set aside. The detainee, is ordered to be set at liberty forthwith if he is not required in connection with any other case. Rule is made absolute accordingly. Direct service is permitted.

**(Z.K.SAIYED, J.)**

KKS