

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED 30.06.2015

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE DR.JUSTICE S.TAMILVANAN  
AND  
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE B.RAJENDRAN

H.C.P.No.3785/2014

Manjula

... Petitioner

Vs

1.State of Tamil Nadu,  
Rep. by its Secretary to Government,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,  
Chennai Police,  
Chennai-600 008.

.... Respondents

Prayer:- This Habeas Corpus Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas corpus to call for the entire records relating to the detenu's detention order passed by the second respondent in BCDFGISSSV/ No.2053/2014 dated 02.12.2014 and to set aside the same and to produce the detenu Narender, son of Gopalakrishnan, aged about 26 years, now detained in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Court and to set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Rajesh Kannan

For Respondents : Mr.M.Maharaja,  
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

The petitioner/mother of the detenu, has filed M.P.No.1 of 2015 in the above petition seeking an order for fixation of early date for final hearing in the above petition, as the detenu has suffering from skin disease as well as other diseases. Hence, this Court after hearing the submissions made on either side, allowed the Miscellaneous Petition today and the above HCP is taken up for final disposal.

2.Challenge is made to the order of detention passed by the second respondent vide Proceedings BCDFGISSSV No.2053/2014 dated 02.12.2014 whereby the detenu/the son of the petitioner herein, by name, Narender, son of Gopalakrishnan, aged about 26 years, was ordered to be detained under the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Slum-grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 (Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982) branding him as a "GOONDA".

3.Though many grounds have been raised in the petition, Mr.A.Rajesh Kannan, the learned counsel for the petitioner has assailed the impugned detention order only on the ground of non-supply of copy of the bail application in similar case, referred to in the grounds of detention, for arriving at the subjective satisfaction that there is likelihood of the detenu coming out on bail, which has affected the constitutional right of making an effective and purposeful representation to the authorities concerned, thereby vitiating the detention.

4.Per contra, Mr.M.Maharaja, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that the impugned detention order has been passed on cogent and sufficient materials and there is no illegality or infirmity in the impugned order of detention. However, he submitted that the copy of the bail application in similar case, referred to in the grounds of detention was not supplied to the detenu.

5.We have given our careful and anxious consideration to the rival submissions put forward by the learned counsel on either side and thoroughly scanned through the impugned detention order and the entire materials available on record.

6.It is seen from paragraph No.4 of the Grounds of Detention that in similar cases, (i) the accused was released on bail by the learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai in CrI.MP.Nos.1259 and 1364/2012 in respect of the case in Cr.No.1062/2011 for the offence u/s.457, 380 IPC on the file of P-3, Vyasarpadi Police Station; (ii) the accused was released on bail by the learned XVII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai in CrI.M.P.No.593/2009 in respect of the case in Cr.No.26/2009 for the offence u/s.379 IPC on the file of R-1, Mambalam Police Station; (iii) the accused was released on bail by the learned Principal Sessions Judge, Chennai in CrI.M.P.No.929/2013 in respect of the case in Cr.No.160/2013 for the offence u/s.341, 294(b), 336, 427, 397 and 506(ii) IPC on the file of V-5,Thirumangalam Police Station. On a perusal of the Paper Book furnished by the Prosecution, it is seen that it does not contain the copy of the said bail application in similar case and only the respective bail order was furnished to the detenu in page Nos.149, 151 & 151 [in

English version and in Vernacular version] in the Booklet placed before us. The said bail application filed in similar case were the documents relied upon by the Detaining Authority to come to a subjective satisfaction that the detenu was likely to be released on bail. Admittedly, such documents have not been supplied to the detenu, as it did not form part of the Paper Book furnished by the Prosecution. Therefore, non supply of the copy of the bail application in similar case to the detenu would vitiate the impugned detention order.

7.The Honourable Supreme Court in M.Ahamed Kutty Vs. Union of India and another (1990-2-SCC-1) has observed thus:-

"7. Considering the facts in the instant case, the bail application and the bail order were vital materials for consideration. If those were not considered the satisfaction of the detaining authority itself would have been impaired and if those had been considered, they would be documents relied on by the detaining authority though not specifically mentioned in the annexure to the order of detention and those ought to have formed part of the documents supplied to the detenu with the grounds of detention and without them the grounds themselves could not be said to have been complete. We have, therefore, no alternative but to hold that it amounted to denial of the detenu's right to make an effective representation and that it resulted in violation of Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India rendering the continued detention of the detenu illegal and entitling the detenu to be set at liberty in this case." (Emphasis added)."

8.This Court in Jarinabegam Vs. State of Tamil Nadu by Secretary to Government, Prohibition and Exercise Department, Chennai and another (2007-1-MLJ-Crl-18) relying upon the decision of the Honourable Supreme Court cited supra has held that non supply of the copy of the bail application in similar case to the detenu has the effect of vitiating the order of detention.

9.As already analysed by us, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, non-supply of the copy of the bail application in similar case, to the detenu has the effect of vitiating the impugned detention order. Further, due to non-supply of such a vital document, the detenu has lost valuable right to make an effective representation to the authorities concerned.

10. In the light of the above said principles laid down by the Honourable Supreme Court and for the reasons stated above, the impugned order of detention is vitiated and the same is liable to be quashed.

11. In the result, this Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The impugned detention order is set aside. The detenu is directed to be released forthwith, unless his presence is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-  
Assistant Registrar(CS III)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

kal

To

1. The Secretary to Government,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,  
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,  
Chennai Police,  
Chennai-600 008.
3. The Superintendent of Central Prison,  
Puzhal, Chennai.
4. The Joint Secretary to Government,  
Public(Law & Order),  
Fort Saint George, Chennai - 9.
5. The Public Prosecutor,  
High Court, Chennai.

+1cc to Mr.M.V.Muralidaran, Advocate, S.R.No.32318

HCP.No.3785/2014

KM(CO)  
CA(15/07/2015)

WEB COPY