

**(2017) 05 DEL CK 0030**

**In the Delhi High Court**

**Case No : 2883 of 2015**

JUGAL KISHORE

APPELLANT

Vs

LT.GOVERNOR, DELHI, & ANR.

RESPONDENT

---

**Date of Decision : 03-05-2017**

**Acts Referred:**

[Indian Penal Code, 1860](#), [Section 34](#), [Section 323](#), [Section 506](#), [Section 511](#), [Section 363](#), [Section 377](#) - Acts d

**Citation : (2017) 05 DEL CK 0030**

**Hon'ble Judges : Ashutosh Kumar**

**Bench : SINGLE BENCH**

**Advocate : V.S.Aggarwal, Richa Kapoor, Ashish Negi**

**Final Decision : Allowed**

---

## **Judgement**

1. Jugal Kishore, the petitioner, has challenged the order dated 26.05.2015 passed by the Additional Deputy Commissioner of Police-I, District East Delhi in connection with File No.21/2013 whereby he was externed for a period of two years with a direction not to enter or return to NCT of Delhi within the aforesaid period without written permission of the competent authority. However, he was permitted to attend the Court at Delhi/New Delhi on all dates of hearing but with the condition that he would immediately remove himself outside the limits of NCT of Delhi thereafter and shall not visit any place other than the Court premises. The

aforesaid relaxation was afforded to him only for the date of hearing in the Court for coming and going out of the limits of the NCT of Delhi.

2. The petitioner is also aggrieved by the order dated 04.11.2015 passed in case No.169/2015-CA whereby the order of the externment referred to above has been affirmed and upheld.

3. It may be noted here that earlier petitioner had approached this Court vide W.P(C) No.1828/2015 challenging the order of the Lieutenant Governor, the appellate authority, dated 01.07.2015 in case No.91/2015 against the externment order passed by the Additional Deputy Commissioner of Police-I, District East Delhi. Since the appellate order was found to be cryptic and without any reasoning, a Bench of this Court set aside the aforesaid order and remitted it back to the Lieutenant Governor, Delhi to decide the petitioner's appeal under Section 51 of the Delhi Police Act, 1978 de novo after affording the parties a reasonable opportunity of being heard in accordance with law. The present appellate order has been passed after giving a fresh hearing to the parties.

4. An externment proposal under Section 47 of the Delhi Police Act, 1978 was sent by the SHO, Gandhi Nagar through ACP, Gandhi Nagar for the externment of the petitioner as he was involved in the following cases:-

S. No.

FIR No.

Date

Section of Law

Police Station

Present Status

1.

108

29.01.1978

12/9/55 Gambling Act

Shahdara

Untraced (not involved)

2.

236

17.09.1988

12/9/55 Gambling Act

Gandhi Nagar

Conviction

3.

210

30.08.1992

323/452/506/34 IPC

Gandhi Nagar

Conviction

4.

89

12.07.1998

147/149/186/341/427 IPC

Gandhi Nagar

Conviction

5.

379

18.10.2004

3/4/9/55 Gambling Act

Gandhi Nagar

Conviction

6.

102

22.03.2006

3/4/9/55 Gambling Act

Gandhi Nagar

Conviction

7.

114

06.05.2010

3/4/8/9/12/55 Gambling Act

Gandhi Nagar

Conviction

8.

408

26.10.2012

323/363/377/506/511/34 IPC

Krishna Nagar

Pending Trial

5. It was proposed, that the petitioner be externed as he was found engaged in various offences and his movements were calculated to cause alarm, harm and danger to persons and property and his presence in Delhi or any part thereof would be hazardous to the community. It was also alleged that witnesses were not willing to come forward to give their evidence in public because of the apprehension of retaliation by the petitioner.

6. From the perusal of the records and the proposal sent for the externment of the petitioner, it appears that the petitioner was made accused in gambling act cases, first time in 1978 and thereafter only in the year 1988. Later, offences under the gambling act were registered against the petitioner in 2004 and 2006. In between 1988 and 2004, the petitioner was made accused twice: one in the year 1992 and the other in 1998 for minor offences under the Indian Penal Code. The petitioner has, in the last been shown to have been made accused in the year 2012 for offences under Sections 323/363/377/506/511 and 34 of the IPC. Out of the aforesaid cases, in most of the offences relating to gambling act, the petitioner has been convicted. Even with respect to cases instituted for the offences under the Indian Penal Code, the petitioner has been convicted. Two cases, one of the year 2004 and the other of 2012 are pending trial.

7. The Additional Commissioner of Police took into account the deposition of Inspector D.P.Singh, East District Lines Delhi who stated before him that he in his capacity as SHO, Gandhi Nagar had sent the proposal of externment for checking the criminal activities of the petitioner and that the petitioner had become almost a terror of the area. As opposed to this assertion of the SHO of the Gandhi Nagar, the defence witnesses namely Pandit Dinesh Chand (DW-1) and Guru Charan Singh (DW-2) stated before the Additional Commissioner that they knew the petitioner as a neighbour who was peacefully living in the area and for the last several years had been pursuing the life of an ordinary citizen. Both the witnesses stated that he has been falsely implicated.

8. The petitioner personally represented before the Additional Commissioner and stated that only because he had filed complaint against the local police that he was falsely implicated for the purposes of destabilising him by slapping externment proceedings against him.

9. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the cases against the petitioner are interspersed over a long span of time from 1978 to 2012 and that also, after long intervals. All the offences alleged are of petty nature. It was submitted that neither the Additional Commissioner of Police nor the appellate authority took into account the defence of the petitioner and the probability of

the same and wrongly externed the petitioner. From the aforesaid list of cases, it was urged, the petitioner could not be said to be a habitual offender. The contention of the police that nobody was coming forward to depose against the petitioner in public is belied by the very fact that out of eight cases referred to in the proposal, the petitioner stands convicted in five cases. In one of the case of 1978, the records could not be traced and for the rest of the two, the petitioner is facing trial. Thus both the orders, it was argued, suffers from the vice of non application of mind. That there is no case after 2012, is an evidence of the fact that the petitioner is on a reformed path and his externment from the local limits of Delhi is without any valid cause.

10. In order to appreciate the contention of the petitioner, it is necessary to have a look at the provisions of the Delhi Police Act, 1978 which deal with externment of a person.

"Section 47 - Removal of persons about to commit offences Whenever it appears to the Commissioner of Police--

(a) that the movements or acts of any person are causing or are calculated to cause alarm, danger or harm to person or property; or

(b) that there are reasonable grounds for believing that such person is engaged or is about to be engaged in the commission of an offence involving force or violence or an offence punishable under Chapter XII, Chapter XVI, Chapter XVII or Chapter XXII of the Indian Penal Code (45 of 1860) or under section 290 or sections 489A to 489E (both inclusive) of that Code or in the abetment of any such offence; or

(c) that such person--

i) is so desperate and dangerous as to render his being at large in Delhi or in any part thereof hazardous to the community; or

ii) has been found habitually intimidating other persons by acts of violence or by show of force; or

iii) habitually commits affray or breach of peace or riot, or habitually makes forcible collection of subscription or threatens people for illegal pecuniary gain for himself or for others; or

iv) has been habitually passing indecent remarks on women and girls, or teasing them by overtures, and that in the opinion of the Commissioner of Police witnesses are not willing to come forward to give evidence in public against such person by reason of apprehension on their part as regards the safety of their person or property, the Commissioner of Police may, by order in writing duly served on such person, or by beat of drum or otherwise as he thinks fit, direct such person to so conduct himself as shall seem necessary in order to prevent violence and alarm or to remove himself outside Delhi or any part thereof, by such route and within such time as the Commissioner of Police may specify and

not to enter or return to Delhi or part thereof, as the case may be, from which he was directed to remove himself.

Explanation.--A person who during a period within one year immediately preceding the commencement of an action under this section has been found on not less than three occasions to have committed or to have been involved in any of the acts referred to in this section shall be deemed to have habitually committed that act.

Section 50 - Hearing to be given before order under section 46, 47 or 48 is passed

(1) Before an order under section 46, section 47 or section 48 is made against any person, the Commissioner of Police shall by notice in writing inform him of the general nature of the material allegations against him and give him a reasonable opportunity of tendering an explanation regarding them.

(2) If such person makes an application for the examination of any witness to be produced by him, the Commissioner of Police shall grant such application and examine such witness, unless for reasons to be recorded in writing, the Commissioner of Police is of opinion that such application is made for the purpose of causing vexation or delay.

(3) Any written explanation put in by such person shall be filed with the record of the case.

(4) Such person shall be entitled to be represented in the proceeding before the Commissioner of Police by a counsel.

(5) (a) The Commissioner of Police may for the purpose of securing the attendance of any person against whom any order is proposed to be made under section 46, section 47 or section 48 require such person, by order in writing, to appear before him and to furnish a security bond with or without sureties for attendance during the inquiry.

(b) The provisions of sections 1.19 to 1.24 (both inclusive) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), shall, so far as may be, apply in relation to the order under clause (a) to furnish security bond.

(6) Without prejudice to the foregoing provisions, the Commissioner of Police, while issuing notice to any person under sub-section (1) may issue a warrant for his arrest and the provisions of sections 70 to 89 (both inclusive) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), shall, so far as may be, apply in relation to such warrant.

(7) The provisions of section 445, section 446, section 447 or section 448 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), shall, so far as may be, apply in relation to all bonds executed under this section.

Section 51 - Appeal against orders under sections 46, 47 or 48

(1) Any person aggrieved by an order made under section 46, section 47 or section 48 may appeal to the Administrator within thirty days from the date of the service of such order on him.

(2) An appeal under this section shall be preferred in duplicate in the form of a memorandum, setting forth concisely the grounds of objection to the order appealed against, and shall be accompanied by that order or a certified copy thereof.

(3) On receipt of such appeal, the Administrator may, after giving a reasonable opportunity to the appellant to be heard either personally or by a counsel and after such further inquiry, if any, as he may deem necessary, confirm, vary or set aside the order appealed against:

Provided that the order appealed against shall remain in force pending the disposal of the appeal, unless the Administrator otherwise directs.

(4) The Administrator shall make every endeavour to dispose of an appeal under this section within a period of three months from the date of receipt of such appeal.

(5) In calculating the period of thirty days provided for an appeal under this section, the time taken for obtaining a certified copy of the order appealed against, shall be excluded.

Section 52 - Finality of order in certain cases - An order passed by the Commissioner of Police under section 46, section 47 or section 48 or the Administrator under section 51 shall not be called in question in any court except on the ground--

(a) that the Commissioner of Police or the Administrator, as the case may be, had not followed the procedure laid down in sub-section (1), sub-section (2) or sub-section (4) of section 50 or in section 51, as the case may be; or

(b) that there was no material before the Commissioner of Police or the Administrator, as the case may be, upon which he could have based his order; or

(c) in the case of an order made under section 47 or an order in appeal therefrom to the Administrator under section 51, the Commissioner of Police or the Administrator, as the case may be, was not of the opinion that witnesses were unwilling to come forward to give evidence in public against the person against whom such order has been made."

11. Section 47 of the Act refers to the situation under which a person could be removed from the territory of Delhi. The situation enumerated are that if the movement of such person causes alarm, danger or harm or the proceedee is or about the commit offences under various sections of the Indian Penal Code or that such person is so desperate and dangerous

so as to render his roaming at large in Delhi would be hazardous to the

community or has been habitually intimidating persons or causing affray or passing indecent remarks on women and girls. If, in conjunction with any one of the grounds or all the grounds, the competent authority frames his opinion that out of fear nobody is coming forward to depose against such person, he could either be directed to behave or to remove himself outside Delhi or to remove himself from any specified part of Delhi for a fixed duration/tenure.

12. The explanation appended to the section defines habitual offender. If a person has involved himself in cases on three occasions or more within one year immediately preceding the commencement of the action, he is a habitual offender.

13. Section 47 of the Act, therefore, refers to two aspects. The Commissioner of Police has first to be satisfied about the proceedee to be a dangerous person and that allowing him to roam at large would be hazardous to the society or cause harm and danger to any person or property or reasonable grounds for believing that he would involve himself in offence affecting human body, property, counterfeiting coins and currency notes. Thereafter, the Commissioner of Police is required to formulate his opinion that witnesses are unwilling to come in open to depose against such person for the fear of their lives. Then only a person/offender/proceedee could either be directed to behave himself or remove himself outside any part of Delhi or remove himself completely outside Delhi.

14. From the records of the case, it appears that the two witnesses who were called on behalf of the petitioner testified to the good behaviour of the petitioner in the locality and his false implication. The petitioner has subjected himself to the process of law in the past and, therefore, was convicted in five of the cases lodged against him. The cases are also not in quick succession but after long intervals. The order of the Additional Commissioner of Police and the appellate Authority do not evince that the defence of the petitioner was seen in the correct perspective.

15. Ms. Richa Kapoor, learned Additional Standing Counsel, while defending the orders submitted that the Additional DCP was satisfied about the criminal proclivity of the petitioner. It is only the subjective satisfaction of authorities, based on materials available on record that the externment order has been passed. It is further submitted by her that the sufficiency of materials on which the externment order was passed cannot be gone into. What is required to be seen is the existence of materials and not the sufficiency of materials. If the materials available on record, satisfies the competent authority to arrive at such conclusion, the same ought not to be interfered with.

16. It is further submitted on behalf of the State that the petitioner has undergone most of the period of the externment order. Learned counsel for the petitioner in response to the above statement submits that it would not make any difference to his submissions regarding the correctness of both the orders and if the orders are not good enough to be sustained in the eyes of law, it would

be no ground for not interfering with them that the externment order has, for most of the part, been executed.

17. The scope of judicial review of the administrative order, it has been argued, is limited to the legality of the decision making process and not the legality of the order per se and no judicial interference is required in the event of the possibility of any plausible view with regard to the petitioner being dangerous and hazardous to the society.

18. The position of law with respect to judicial interference in matters of administrative decisions has been well crystallized by now. The oft quoted and referred decision in this regard is in *Associated Provincial Picture Houses Ltd vs. Wednesbury Corporation*, (1947) 2 All E.R 680. The principle enunciated in the aforesaid case is popularly known as *Wednesbury principles*. The aforesaid decision takes note of the fact that in order to test the "reasonableness" of the order, the Court has to find out whether relevant factors have been taken into account for coming to any conclusion. What is important to see is whether the action of the executive is within the parameters of law and that the decision passes the test of reasonableness. If the administrative order is irrational, or has been arrived at without taking into consideration relevant factors which ought to have been taken into account and/or suffers from the procedural irregularities, the same can definitely be reviewed and corrected.

19. True it is that the sufficiency of the material for the police authority to come to the conclusion about the petitioner being dangerous cannot be gone into; nonetheless such executive order cannot be sustained if it is based on distorted/ illogical grounds.

20. The relevant provisions of the Delhi Police Act have been enacted for the purpose of preventing crime and making society worth living. Keeping this object in mind, even before the threshold of the commission of crime by any person, considering his criminal dispensation and proclivity, he could be removed from the confines of Delhi.

21. Nonetheless, there can be no dispute that an externment order brings in societal and personal deprivation and is a great blow on the finances of the externnee. An order of externment makes an inroad into the cherished and valuable right of a person to have his domicile at the place of his choice.

22. This Court is mindful of the fact that unless such stringent measures are taken against such law breakers, it would be difficult for police authorities to maintain an even tempo of the society. At the same time the rights and liberties of a person cannot be lightly interfered with and has to be guarded with utmost zeal.

23. The provisions of Section 47 and 50 therefore, have to be read strictly. Considering the strain that it puts on an externnee, the considerations for externing a person ought to be in consonance with the requirements of law and

the satisfaction arrived at by the executive authorities must pass the test of reasonableness. Any executive order which is not informed with fairness cannot be sustained on any account.

24. There must be a clear and present danger in allowing the petitioner to remain at large in jail for countenancing the order of externment.

25. From the perusal of the externment order as also the appellate order, this Court is of the opinion that there was no sufficient reason to believe that the petitioner was so desperate and dangerous that his presence in NCT or any part thereof would be hazardous to the community and its safety. Both the orders referred to above, suffer from vice of non application of mind with respect to relevant considerations namely

- i. the frequency of the cases in a particular year,
- ii. consideration of the fact whether the petitioner has improved himself,
- iii. the urgency of externing the petitioner in 2015,
- iv. requirement of the petitioner to be in Delhi to attend to cases which are pending trial,
- v. the financial burden on the proceedee in coming from outside Delhi to Delhi Courts,
- vi. the possibility of delay in disposal of cases and, therefore, delay in vindication of the assertion of either i.e. the petitioner or the prosecuting agency,

26. There does not appear to be any material so as to justify the assessment that witnesses are not daring to come in open to depose against the petitioner.

27. Tested on the touchstone of aforementioned facts and principles, the externment and the appellate orders cannot be sustained in the eyes of law.

28. The externment order dated 26.05.2015 passed by the Additional DCP and the appellate order dated 04.11.2015 passed by the LG, Delhi are, therefore, quashed.

29. The petition stands disposed of accordingly. CrI. M.A. No.17973/2015

1. In view of the main petition having been allowed, this application becomes infructuous.

2. This application is disposed of accordingly.