

(2015) 01 MAD CK 0034
In the Madras High Court
Case No : H.C.P. No. 2424 of 2014

Muthuramalingam

APPELLANT

Vs

State of Tamilnadu and Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 29-01-2015

Acts Referred:

Constitution of India, 1950 — Article 22(5)
Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders,
Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders and Slum-Grabbers, Act, 1982 — Section 3(1),
4(1)(aaa), 4(1)(i), 4(1-A)

Citation : (2015) 01 MAD CK 0034

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

Bench : Division Bench

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

Final Decision : Allowed

Judgement

1. This Habeas Corpus Petition is filed, by the detenu, namely, Muthuramalingam, aged 35 years, son of Shanmugam, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records, in BDFGISSV No. 1072/2014 dated 26.08.2014, 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 "Bootlegger", 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.C.C. Chellappan, 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 and the copy of the bail order 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.

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 has not refuted that the copy of the bail application in similar case, referred to in the grounds of detention was 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 Principal Sessions Court, in Crl.M.P. No.12727/2011 in respect of Crime No. 579/2011 on the file of Prohibition Enforcement Wing, Flower Bazaar Unit for the offence under sections 4(1)(i) and 4(1)(aaa) r/w 4(1-A) of TNP Act. 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. The said bail application and the bail order 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 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 application and the copy of the bail order 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, 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 Vs. The State of Tamil Nadu*, 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 and the copy of the bail order 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.