

(2020) 06 GUJ CK 0063
In the Gujarat High Court

Case No : R/Special Civil Application No. 6211 Of 2020

Parth @ Jambli Jitendrabhai Kantivara (Sindhi)

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Gujarat

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 01-06-2020

Acts Referred:

Constitution Of India, 1950 — Article 226

Gujarat Prevention Of Anti Social Activities Act, 1985 — Section 2(b), 3(2)

Citation : (2020) 06 GUJ CK 0063

Hon'ble Judges : A.J.Desai, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Pratik Y Jasani, KM Antani

Final Decision : Allowed

Judgement

A.J.Desai, J

[1] This petition is directed against the order of detention dated 13/02/2020 passed by respondent No.2 herein - District Magistrate, Ahmedabad in

exercise of powers conferred under Section 3(2) of the Gujarat Prevention of Anti Social Activities Act, 1985 (in short "the PASA Act") by

detaining the detinue as a "bootlegger" as defined under Section 2(b) of the Act. Along with the order of detention, the detinue is also served

with the grounds of detention. In the grounds of detention, there is a reference to one prohibition case pending against the detinue. The case is

registered under the provisions of the Bombay Prohibition Act.

[2] Mr. Pratik Jasani, learned advocate for the detinue submits that registration of FIR itself cannot lead to disturbance of even tempo of public life

and therefore the public order. The order of detention is assailed by the detinue on various grounds mentioned in the memo of the petition. However,

learned counsel for the detainee submits that, except FIR registered under the Bombay Prohibition Act, there was no other material before the

detaining authority whereby it could be inferred reasonably that the detainee is a 'bootlegger' within the meaning of Section 2(b) of the Act and

required to be detained as the detainee's activities are prejudicial to the maintenance of public health and public order. In support of the above

submission, learned counsel for the detainee has placed reliance on judgment of the Apex Court in the case of Piyush Kantilal Mehta vs.

Commissioner of police, AIR 1989 Supreme Court 491 and the recent judgment dated 28.3.2011 passed by the Division Bench of this Court [Coram:

S.J. Mukhopadhaya C.J. & J.B. Pardiwala, JJ.] in Letters Patent Appeal No2732 of 2010 in Special Civil Application No.9492 of 2010 (Aartiben vs.

Commissioner of Police) which would squarely help the detainee.

[3] Mr. Antani, learned Assistant Government Pleader submitted that registration of FIR would go to show that the detainee had, in fact, indulged into

such activities, which can be said to be disturbing the public health and public order and in view of sufficient material before the detaining authority to

pass the order of detention, no interference is called for by this Court in exercise of its power under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

[4] Having heard the rival submissions of the parties and perused the record of the case, I am of the view that FIR registered under the Bombay

Prohibition Act alone cannot be said to be sufficient enough to arrive at subjective satisfaction to the effect that the activities, as alleged, are

prejudicial to the public order or lead to disturbance of public order. There has to be nexus and link for such activities with disturbance of the public

order. On careful perusal of the material available on record and the ratio laid down by the Apex Court in the case of Piyush Kantilal Mehta (supra)

and the recent judgment dated 28.3.2011 passed by the Division Bench of this Court [Coram: S.J. Mukhopadhaya C.J. & J.B. Pardiwala, JJ.] in

Letters Patent Appeal No2732 of 2010 in Special Civil Application No.9492 of 2010 (Aartiben vs. Commissioner of Police), I am of the view that the

activities of the detainee cannot be said to be in any manner prejudicial to the public order and therefore, the order of detention passed by the detaining

authority cannot be sustained and is required to be quashed and set aside.

[5] In the result, the petition is allowed. The impugned order of detention dated

13/02/2020 passed by respondent No.2 herein, is hereby quashed and set aside. The detenue is ordered to be set at liberty forthwith if he is not required to be detained in connection with any other case. Rule is made absolute accordingly.

Registry is hereby directed to communicate the present order through fax / email to the concerned authority forthwith.