

**(2010) 10 GUJ CK 0011**

**In the Gujarat High Court**

**Case No : Special Civil Application No. 10086 of 2010**

Rajesh @ Raju through Ajyakumar Chh

APPELLANT

Vs

State of Gujarat and Others

RESPONDENT

**Date of Decision : 25-10-2010**

**Acts Referred:**

Constitution of India, 1950 — Article 226

Gujarat Prevention of Anti-social Activities Act, 1985 — Section 3(2)

**Citation : (2010) 10 GUJ CK 0011**

**Hon'ble Judges : J.C. Upadhyaya, J**

**Bench : Single Bench**

**Advocate : Sajnika Patel, for Subhadra G. Patel, for the Appellant; C.M. Shah, Ld. Asst. Government Pleader for Respondents 1 and 3, for the Respondent**

**Final Decision : Allowed**

## Judgement

J.C. Upadhyaya, J.—The Petitioner-Ajaykumar Chhaganbhai Patel filed the present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, challenging the detention of his brother-in-law detenu-Rajesh @ Raju Nathubhai Koli pursuant to the detention order dated 01st July, 2010, which was executed on 03rd August, 2010, passed by the Respondent-Commissioner of Police, Surat City, by exercising the powers conferred under Sub-section (2) of Section 3 of the Gujarat Prevention of Anti Social Activities Act, 1985 ("PASA Act", for short). The detenu is branded as "bootlegger".

2. Heard Ms. Sajnika Patel, learned Advocate for Ms. Subhadra Patel, learned Advocate for the Petitioner and Ms. C.M. Shah, learned Assistant Government Pleader for the Respondents. Affidavit-in-reply filed by the Respondent-Commissioner of Police, Surat City has been taken into consideration.

3. The detenu came to be detained as "bootlegger" on his involvement in one offence arising under the Bombay Prohibition Act.

4. It has been submitted by the learned Counsel for the Petitioner that it is a

settled legal position that on registration of one offence, no order of detention could have been passed, as the detenu cannot be branded as "bootlegger". It has been further submitted that the activities of the detenu cannot be said to be injurious to the public health or public order. It has been further submitted by the learned Counsel for the Petitioner that there is gross delay in passing the order of detention as well as gross delay in executing the order of detention.

5. Per contra, Ms. C.M. Shah, learned Assistant Government Pleader representing the Respondents supported the detention order dated 01st July, 2010 passed by Respondent-Commissioner of Police, Surat City and submitted that before passing the detention order, the detention authority took into consideration all the relevant papers and after subjective satisfaction, the detention order is passed and thus the detention order is legal and proper and no interference in the said order is warranted and consequently the petition deserves dismissal.

6. I have gone through the grounds of detention and considered the submissions advanced on behalf of both the sides.

7. The Court is of the opinion that there is much substance in the arguments advanced by learned Counsel for the Petitioner. It is seen from the grounds that a general statement has been made by the detaining authority that consuming liquor is injurious to health. In fact, a perusal of the order passed by the detaining authority shows that the grounds which are mentioned in the order are in reference to the situation of "law and order" and not "public order". Therefore, on this ground, the subjective satisfaction of the detaining authority is vitiated on account of non-application of mind and the impugned order, therefore, deserves to be quashed and set aside.

8. Except the general statement, there is no material on record which shows that the detenu is carrying on illegal activities of selling liquor or is engaged in such activity, which is harmful to the health of the public. In the case of Ashokbhai Jivraj @ Jivabhai Solanki v. Police Commissioner, Surat reported in 2001 (1) GLH 393, having considered the decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia Vs. State of Bihar and Others, this Court held that the cases wherein the detention orders are passed on the basis of the statements of such witnesses fall under the maintenance of "law and order" and not "public Order".

9. Applying the ratio of the above decisions, it is clear that before passing an order of detention, the detaining authority must come to a definite findings that there is threat to the "public order" and it is very clear that the present case would not fall within the category of threat to a public order. In that view of the matter, when the order of detention has been passed by the detaining authority without having adequate grounds for passing the said order, cannot be sustained and, therefore, it deserves to be quashed and set aside.

10. In the result, this petition is allowed. The impugned order of detention dated 01st July, 2010 passed by the Respondent-Commissioner of Police, Surat City, is hereby quashed and set aside. The detenu-Rajesh @ Raju Nathubhai Koli is

ordered to be set at liberty forthwith, if not required in any other case. Rule is made absolute accordingly. Direct Service is permitted.