
(2015) 06 MAD CK 0112
In the Madras High Court
Case No : H.C.P. No. 3773 of 2014

Suguna

APPELLANT

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu and Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 16-06-2015

Acts Referred:

Constitution of India, 1950 — Article 22(5)

Penal Code, 1860 (IPC) — Section 294 (b), 307, 336, 341, 384

Citation : (2015) 06 MAD CK 0112

Hon'ble Judges : S. Tamilvanan, J;C.T. Selvam, J

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : O.M. Sairam for Om Sai Ram Associates, for the Appellant; M. Maharaja, APP, Advocates for the Respondent

Final Decision : Allowed

Judgement

Dr. S. Tamilvanan, J.—Challenge is made to the order of detention passed by the second respondent vide Memo No. 1986/BCDFGISSSV/2014, dated 28.11.2014, whereby the detenu/the husband of the petitioner herein, by name, Madhavan, Son of Manoharan, aged 29 years, was ordered to be detained under the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law offenders, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Sexual Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 (Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982) branding him as a "GOONDA".

2. Though many grounds have been raised in the petition, Mr.O.M. Sairam for M/s. Om Sairam Associates, the learned counsel for the petitioner has assailed the impugned detention order only on the ground of non-supply of copies of the bail applications in the 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.M.Maharaja, 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 the similar cases, 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 cases, the accused were granted bail, (a) by the learned V Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Egmore, Chennai in CrI.M.P. No. 460 of 2013, in respect of the case in Crime No. 164 of 2013, in respect of the case in Crime No. 164 of 2013 for the offence under Sections 384 and 506 (ii) IPC on the file of K-3 Aminjikarai Police Station (b) by the learned Principal Sessions Judge, at Thiruvallur in CrI.M.P. No. 2392 of 2012, in respect of the case in Crime No. 1960 of 2012 for the offence under Sections 341, 294 (b), 336, 427, 392, 397 and 506 (ii) IPC on the file of T-1 Ambattur Police Station; and (c). by the learned Principal Sessions Judge, Chennai in CrI.M.P. No. 10992 of 2011, in respect of the case in Crime No. 1640 of 2011 for the offence under Sections 294 (b), 341, 336, 307, 397 and 506 (ii) IPC on the file of V-5 Thirumangalam Police Station. On a perusal of the Paper Book furnished by the Prosecution, it is seen that it does not contain any of the documents, viz., the bail applications, in respect of the similar cases. The said bail applications filed in similar cases 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 documents have 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 and other documents in similar cases to the detenu would vitiate the impugned detention order.

6. The Honourable Supreme Court in M. Ahamedkutti 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 applications 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*, (2007) 1 LW(Cri) 276 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 of detention.

8. As already analysed by us, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, non-supply of the documents, viz., bail applications, 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.