

(2019) 02 J&K CK 0073

In the Jammu And Kashmir High Court

Case No : Habeas Corpus Petition (HCP) No. 314 Of 2018

Hakim Abdul Rash

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Jammu & Kashmir And Anr

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 19-02-2019

Acts Referred:

Jammu & Kashmir Public Safety Act, 1978 — Section 8
Constitution Of India, 1950 — Article 22(5), 22(6)

Citation : (2019) 02 J&K CK 0073

Hon'ble Judges : Rashid Ali Dar, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Wajid Haseeb, Irfan Andleeb

Judgement

1. In pursuance to order No.DMS/PSA/27/2018 dated 20.09.2018, issued by District Magistrate, Srinagar, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 8 of the J&K Public Safety Act, Shri Hakim Abdul Rashid son of Late Hakim Ghulam Rasool resident of Botakadal Srinagar (hereinafter referred to as the detainee), has been taken into preventive custody. By the instant petition quashment of the said order is sought on the grounds enumerated in the petition.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner projected various grounds but the star ground is that the material which formed base of the grounds of detention and consequent order of detention has not been furnished to the detainee, besides translated copies of the grounds of detention have not been furnished to him which disabled him from making an effective and purposeful representation against his detention.

3. The submission appears to have force as nothing has been brought on record to show that the material forming base of the grounds of detention and consequent order of detention has been furnished to the detainee. Non-supply of the material would amount to violation of Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India, so deprivation of a valuable right.

4. The Hon'ble Apex Court in its judgment captioned Thahira Haris etc. etc. Vs. Government of Karnataka & Ors, reported in AIR 2009 Supreme Court 2184, has held as under:

"27. There were several grounds on which the detention of the detenu was challenged in these appeals but it is not necessary to refer to all the grounds since on the ground of not supplying the relied upon document, continued detention of the detenu becomes illegal and detention order has to be quashed on that ground alone.

28. Our Constitution provides adequate safeguards under clauses (5) and (6) of Article 22 to the detenu who has been detained in pursuance of the order made under any law providing for preventive detention. He has right to be supplied copies of all documents, statements and other materials relied upon in the grounds of detention without any delay. The predominant object of communicating the grounds of detention is to enable the detenu at the earliest opportunity to make effective and meaningful representation against his detention.

5. The records also do not suggest that the translated copies of grounds of detention have been supplied to the detenu, therefore, infringement of right guaranteed under Article 22(5) of the Constitution. The service of the grounds of detention on the detenu is a very precious constitutional right and the object behind the same is to enable the detenu to file an effective representation. It will be an empty formality to supply the grounds of detention to the detenu unless he is in a position to understand the same. In my view I am fortified by the judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case "Chaju Ram Vs. The State of Jammu & Kashmir" reported in AIR 1971 SC 263. Following portion from para 9 of the judgment shall be quite apposite to be quoted:

"..... The detenu is an illiterate person and it is absolutely necessary that when we are dealing with a detenu who cannot read or understand English language or any language at all that the grounds of detention should be explained to him as early as possible in the language he understands so that he can avail himself of the statutory right of making a representation. To hand over to him the document written in English and to obtain his thumb impression on it in token of his having received the same does not comply with the requirements of the law which gives a very valuable right to the detenu to make a representation which right is frustrated by handing over to him the grounds of detention in an alien language. We are therefore compelled to hold in this case that the requirement of explaining the grounds to the detenu in his own language was not complied with."

6. It shall be quite advantageous to quote following para from the judgment rendered in case captioned Powanammal vs. State of T. N. and another reported in 1999 (2) SCC 413:

"The amplitude of the safeguard embodied in Article 22(5) extends not merely to

oral explanation of the grounds of detention and the material in support thereof in the language understood by the detainee but also to supplying their translation in script or language which is understandable to the detainee. Failure to do so would amount to denial of the rights of being communicated the grounds and of being afforded the opportunity of making a representation against the order."

7. For what has been stated above, petition is allowed and the impugned detention order bearing No.DMS/PSA/27/2018 dated 20.09.2018, being unsustainable, is quashed. Detainee is directed to be set free from the preventive custody forthwith provided he is not required in connection with any other case.

8. Detention record be returned to the learned counsel for the respondents.