

(2015) 01 MAD CK 0308
In the Madras High Court
Case No : H.C.P. No. 3104 of 2014

Meena

APPELLANT

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu and Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 08-01-2015

Acts Referred:

Constitution of India, 1950 — Article 22(5)
Penal Code, 1860 (IPC) — Section 294(b), 324, 341, 380, 384
Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders,
Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders and Slum-Grabbers, Act, 1982 — Section 3(1)

Citation : (2015) 01 MAD CK 0308

Hon'ble Judges : M. Jaichandren, J; Aruna Jagadeesan, J

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : S. Elankumaran, for the Appellant; C. Emalias, APP, Advocates for the Respondent

Final Decision : Allowed

Judgement

1. This Habeas Corpus Petition is filed, by the mother of the detenu, namely, Jagan, aged 39 years, son of Nagalingam, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records, in No. 602/BDFGISSV/2014 dated 28.04.2014, passed by the 2nd Respondent, detaining the detenu, under Section 3(1) 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 14/1982) the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982, branding him as a "Goonda", in the Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, and to quash the same and to direct the Respondents to produce the body of the detenu and set him at liberty forthwith.

2. Though several grounds have been raised in this Habeas Corpus Petition, Mr. S. Elankumaran, 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 cases, 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.

3. Per contra, Mr. C. Emalias, 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 applications in similar case, referred to in the grounds of detention were not supplied to the detenu.

4. 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.

5. It is seen from paragraph No. 4 of the Grounds of Detention that in similar case, the accused was released on bail by the learned XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Saidapet, Chennai, in Crl. M.P. No. 3340 of 2012 in Crime No. 1283 of 2010 on the file E1 Mylapore Police Station for the offence under sections 457 and 380 IPC and by the learned Vth Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Egmore, Chennai in Crl. M.P. No. 1325/2013 in Crime No. 501/2013 on the file of K7 ICF Police Station for the offence under sections 341, 294(b), 324, 384 and 506(ii) IPC. 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 applications in similar cases. The said bail applications filed in similar case were the document relied upon by the Detaining Authority to come to a subjective satisfaction that the detenu was likely to be released on bail. Admittedly, such a document has 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 applications in similar case to the detenu would vitiate the impugned detention order.

6. The Honourable Supreme Court in M. Ahamedkutty Vs. Union of India (UOI) and Another, (1990) 47 ELT 188 : (1990) 1 JT 143 : (1990) 2 SCC 1 : (1990) 1 SCR 209 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)."

7. This Court in *Jarinabegam v. 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 or detention.

8. 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.

9. 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.

10. 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.