
(2013) 11 GUJ CK 0026

In the Gujarat High Court

Case No : Special Civil Application No. 13432 of 2013

Manojising Bharatsing Rajpurohit

APPELLANT

Vs

State of Gujarat and Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 18-11-2013

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2013) 11 GUJ CK 0026

Hon'ble Judges : S.H. Vora, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Jayshree C. Bhatt, for the Petitioners No. 1, for the Appellant; Jirga Jhaveri, AGP for the Respondent(s) No. 3, for the Respondent

Final Decision : Allowed

Judgement

S.H. Vora, J.—Heard learned counsel for the parties. This petition is directed against the order of detention dated 25.06.2013 passed by the respondent No. 2 in exercise of powers conferred u/s 3(2) of the Gujarat Prevention of Anti Social Activities Act, 1985 (for short the Act) by detaining the detainee as a "dangerous person" as defined u/s 2(c) of the Act

2. Learned advocate Ms. J.C. Bhatt for the detainee submits that the order of detention impugned in this petition deserves to be quashed and set aside and the ground that the registration of two offences registered before Malviyanagar police station, Rajkot City vide I-C.R. No. 269 of 2012 for the offence punishable under Sections 454, 457, 380 and 114 of the Indian Penal Code and another offence registered before the same police station vide I-C.R. No. 384 of 2012 for the offence punishable under Sections 454, 457, 380 and 114 of the Indian Penal Code by itself cannot bring the case of the detainee within the purview of definition "dangerous person" u/s 2(c) of the Act. Learned advocate Ms. J.C. Bhatt for the detainee further submits that illegal activity carried out as alleged cannot have any nexus or bearing with maintenance of public order and at the most it can be said to be breach of law and order. Further, except statements of witnesses and registration of FIRs, no other relevant or cogent material is

available on record connecting the alleged anti-social activities of the detainee with breach of the public order.

Section 2(c) of the Act defines the term "dangerous person" as under:-

2(c). "dangerous person" means a person, who either by himself or as a member or leader of a gang, habitually commits, or attempts to commit or abets the commission of any of the offences punishable under Chapter XVI or Chapter XVII of the Indian Penal Code (GLV of 1860) or any of the offences punishable under Chapter V of the Arms Act, 1959 (54 of 1959).

3. Learned advocate for the detainee, placing reliance on the decisions reported in the cases of (i) Ranubhai Bhikhabhai Bharwad (Vekaria) Vs. State of Gujarat, (ii) Ashokbhai Jivraj @ Jivabhai Solanki Vs. Police Commissioner, and (iii) Mustakmiya Jabbarmiya Shaikh Vs. M.M. Mehta, Commissioner of Police and Others, , submitted that the case on hand is squarely covered by the ratio laid down in the aforesaid decisions. Learned advocate for the detainee further submits that it is not possible to hold in the facts of the present case that the activities of the detainee with reference to the criminal case/s had affected even tempo of the society, posing a threat to the very existence of the normal and routine life of the people at large or that on the basis of the criminal cases, the detainee had put the entire social apparatus in disorder, making it difficult for whole system to exist as a system governed by the rule of law by disturbing public order.

4. Learned A.G.P. Ms. Jhaveri for the respondent-State supported the detention order passed by the authority and submitted that the detainee is a "dangerous person" and sufficient material and evidence was found during the course of investigation, which was also supplied to the detainee, indicating that the detainee is in habit of indulging into activities as defined u/s 2(c) of the Act and considering the facts of the case, the detaining authority has rightly passed the order of detention and the detention order deserves to be upheld by this Court.

5. The order of detention is passed on the basis of what has come to be known as the subjective satisfaction of the detaining authority such subjective satisfaction has to be arrived at on two points. Firstly, on the veracity of facts imputed to the person to be detained and secondly, on the prognostication of the detaining authority that the person concerned is likely to indulge again in the same kind of notorious activities. Whereas, normal laws are primarily concerned with the act of commission of the offence, the detention laws are concerned with character of the person who has committed or is likely to commit an offence. The detaining authority has, therefore, to be satisfied that the person sought to be detained is of such a type that he will continue to violate the laws of the land if he is not preventively detained. So, the commission of isolated laws of infraction of law, not done in an organized or systematic manner, may not be sufficient for the detaining authority to justifiably come to the conclusion that there is no alternate but to preventively detain the person.

6. No doubt, neither the possibility of launching of a criminal proceedings nor pendency of any criminal proceedings is an absolute bar to an order of preventive detention. But, failure of the detaining authority to consider the possibility of either launching or pendency of criminal proceedings may, in the circumstances of a case, lead to the conclusions that the detaining authority has not applied its mind to the vital question whether it was necessary to make an order of preventive detention. Since there is an allegation that the order of detention is issued in a mechanical manner without keeping in mind whether it was necessary to make such an order when an ordinary criminal proceedings could well serve the purpose. The detaining authority must satisfy the court that the question too was borne in mind before the order of detention was made. In the case on hand, the detaining authority failed to satisfy the court that the detaining authority so bore the question in mind and, therefore, the court is justified in drawing the inference that there was no application of mind by detaining authority to the vital question whether it was necessary to preventively detain the detainee.

7. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the facts and circumstances of the case, it appears that the subjective satisfaction arrived at by the detaining authority cannot be said to be legal, valid and in accordance with law inasmuch as the offences alleged in the FIR/s cannot have any bearing on the public order since the law of the land i.e. Indian Penal Code and other relevant penal laws are sufficient enough to take care of the situation and that the allegations as have been levelled against the detainee cannot be said to be germane for the purpose of bringing the detainee as a "dangerous person" within the meaning of Section 2(c) of the Act and, unless and until the material is there to make out a case that the person concerned has become a threat and a menace to the society so as to disturb the whole tempo of the society and that the whole social apparatus is in peril disturbing public order at the instance of such person, it cannot be said that the detainee is a "dangerous person" within the meaning of Section 2(c) of the Act. Except general statement, there is no material on record which shows that the detainee is acting in such a manner which is dangerous to the public order. In view of the ratio laid down by the Hon"ble Supreme Court in the cases of (i) Ranubhai Bhikhabhai Bharwad (Vekaria)(supra); (ii) Ashokbhai Jivraj @Jivabhai Solanki (supra); and (iii) Mustakmiya Jabbarmiya Shaikh (supra), the Court is of the opinion that the activities of the detainee cannot be said to be dangerous to the maintenance of public order and at the most fall under the maintenance of "law and order."

8. As a result of hearing and perusal of the record, it appears that the only material that was available with the detaining authority was the criminal case registered against the detainee, as aforesaid, and on that basis, it cannot be said that the activity of the detainee has become a threat to the maintenance of "public order" and "public health". Mere involvement of the detainee in such activity may not amount to dangerous activity by the detainee and mere mention of them, unless supported by any evidence, cannot be said to be material

germane for the purpose of arriving at the subjective satisfaction that the activity of the detainee is prejudicial to the maintenance of "public order" and "public health". In this connection, it will be fruitful to refer to a decision of the Supreme Court in *Pushkar Mukherjee and Others Vs. The State of West Bengal*, where the distinction between "law and order" and "public order" has been clearly laid down. The Court observed as follows:

Does the expression "public order" take in every kind of infraction of order or only some categories thereof? It is manifest that every act of assault or injury to specific persons does not lead to public disorder. When two people quarrel and fight and assault each other inside a house or in a street, it may be said that there is disorder but not public disorder. Such cases are dealt with under the powers vested in the executive authorities under the provisions of ordinary criminal law but the culprits cannot be detained on the ground that they were disturbing public order. The contravention of any law always affects order but before it can be said to affect public order, it must affect the community or the public at large. In this connection we must draw a line of demarcation between serious and aggravated forms of disorder which directly affect the community or injure the public interest and the relatively minor breaches of peace of a purely local significance which primarily injure specific individuals and only in a secondary sense public interest. A mere disturbance of law and order leading to disorder is thus not necessarily sufficient for action under the Preventive Detention Act but a disturbance which will affect public order comes within the scope of the Act.

9. In view of the above, I am inclined to allow this petition because simpliciter registration of FIRs by itself cannot have any nexus with the breach of maintenance of public order and the authority can take recourse under the Indian Penal Code and no other relevant or cogent material exists for invoking powers u/s 3(2) of the Act. In the result, this Special Civil Application is allowed. The impugned order of detention dated 25.06.2013 passed by the respondent No. 2 is hereby quashed and set aside. The detainee is ordered to be set at liberty forthwith if not required in any other case. Rule is made absolute accordingly. Direct service is permitted.