
(2015) 03 MAD CK 0263
In the Madras High Court
Case No : H.C.P. No. 2786 of 2014

R. Saranya

APPELLANT

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu and Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 10-03-2015

Acts Referred:

Constitution of India, 1950 — Article 22(5)
Penal Code, 1860 (IPC) — Section 294(b), 336, 341, 397, 427
Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders,
Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders and Slum-Grabbers, Act, 1982 — Section 3, 3(1)

Citation : (2015) 1 LW(Cri) 425

Hon'ble Judges : M. Jaichandren, J;K.B.K. Vasuki, J

Bench : Division Bench

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

Final Decision : Allowed

Judgement

1. This Habeas Corpus Petition is filed by the wife of the detenu, namely, Ranjith Kumar, aged 26 years, son of Rajendran, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records in BDFGISSV No. 1149 of 2014 dated 4.9.2014 passed by the second 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 of 1982), read with orders issued by the Government in G.O. (D) No. 143, Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department, dated 18.7.2014, under Sub Section (2) of Section 3 of the said Act, 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. Though several grounds have been raised in this Habeas Corpus Petition, 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 filed 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.

2. Per contra, 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 application was not supplied to the detenu.

3. 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.

4. It is seen from paragraph 4 of the Grounds of Detention that in a similar case registered at V-5, Thirumangalam Police Station in Crime No. 160 of 2013, under Sections 341, 294(b), 336, 427, 397 and 506(ii) I.P.C., bail was granted by the Principal Sessions Court, Chennai, in CrI. M.P. No. 929 of 2013. 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 filed in similar case. The said bail application filed in similar case was a 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 application in similar case to the detenu would vitiate the impugned detention order.

5. 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)."

6. This Court in *Jarinabegam Vs. The State of Tamil Nadu*, (2007) 1 LW(Cri) 276 relying upon the decision of the Honourable Supreme Court cited supra has held

that non-supply of a copy of the bail application to the detenu has the effect of vitiating the order of detention.

7. As already analysed by us, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, non-supply of the copy of the bail application filed 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.

8. 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. In the result, this Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The impugned detention is set aside. The detenu is directed to be released forthwith, unless his presence is required in connection with any other case.