
(2015) 07 MAD CK 0258
In the Madras High Court
Case No : H.C.P. No. 455 of 2015

Vijayalakshmi

APPELLANT

Vs

The Principal Secretary and Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 06-07-2015

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2015) 07 MAD CK 0258

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

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : 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 Proceedings in Cr.MP.No.25/2014/C1 dated 18.12.2014, whereby the detenu/the husband of the petitioner by name Satheesh @ Satheeshkumar, aged 28 years, son of Arumugam, was ordered to be detained under the provisions of 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) branding him as a "GOONDA".

2. Though many grounds have been raised in the petition, M/s. R. Subhadra Devi, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, confines her argument only in respect of non-application of mind on the part of the detaining authority in passing the order of detention.

3. According to the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, the detenu has been in remand in the ground case [Cr.No.245/2014] registered by the Kodumudi Police Station and he has not moved any bail application in the said case as on the date of the passing of the detention order. The Detaining authority has not even stated whether the detenu has filed any bail application or not in the said case. But the detaining authority has merely stated that "the normal criminal law

will not have the desired effect to prevent him from indulging in such activities, which are prejudicial to the maintenance of public health and public order". He has not specifically stated that there is a "REAL POSSIBILITY" or "IMMINENT POSSIBILITY" of the detenu coming out on bail in the ground case or in the adverse cases. He adds that absence of the said expression in the grounds of detention would vitiate the order of detention. The learned counsel would add that admittedly, in this case, no bail application has been filed by the detenu in the above said case. When no bail application is filed, then there is no real possibility that the detenu would be released on bail. If that be so, there is no imminent possibility of the detenu coming out on bail. No cogent materials are available before the Detaining Authority to conclude / to apprehend that the detenu would likely to get bail in the ground case. The inference has to be drawn from the available material on record. In the absence of such material on record, the mere ipse dixit of the detaining authority is not sufficient to sustain the order of the detention. Hence, it is stated that the Detaining Authority has passed the impugned detention order in total nonapplication of mind. In support of his contention that the expression in explicit terms about the imminent possibility of the detenu coming out on bail should be there in the order of detention and the absence would vitiate the order of detention, he relies on the judgments of the Hon"ble Apex Court reported in [a] T.V. Saravanan @ S.A.R. Prasana Venkatachaariar Chaturvedi Vs. State through Secretary and Another, AIR 2006 SC 1462 : (2006) CriLJ 1619 : (2006) 2 JT 433 : (2006) 2 SCALE 358 : (2006) 2 SCC 664 : (2006) 1 UJ 598 : (2006) AIRSCW 2849 : (2006) 4 Supreme 578 ; [b] Velumurugan @ Velu Vs. The Commissioner of Police and Another, (2005) 1 CTC 577 and [c] Huidrom Konungjao Singh Vs. State of Manipur and Others, AIR 2012 SC 2002 : (2012) CriLJ 2935 : (2012) 5 SCALE 628 : (2012) 7 SCC 181 : (2012) AIRSCW 3043 : (2012) 4 Supreme 151 .

4. Per contra, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that the order of detention has been passed on cogent and sufficient materials and the same cannot be interfered with at the instance of the petitioner. Therefore, he submits that the Habeas Corpus Petition does not merit any consideration and the same is liable to be dismissed.

5. We have heard the learned counsel for both sides with regard to the facts and citation.

6. As evidenced from paragraph 5 of the Grounds of Detention, the detenu is said to be remand in the ground case and whether the detenu has moved any bail application in the said case or not as on the date of passing of the detention order, has not been stated by the Detaining Authority. Also, as evidenced from the above ground, the Detaining Authority has not stated specifically that there is an "IMMINENT POSSIBILITY" or "REAL POSSIBILITY" of the detenu coming out on bail. The Detaining Authority has merely stated that the detenu is lodged as a remand prisoner in the ground case at the Central Prison, Coimbatore. This would show that the Detaining Authority passed the order of detention

mechanically and without application of mind and the facts do not justify the detention. Moreover, the expression, in explicit terms about the imminent possibility of the detenu coming out on bail is absent. If that be so, the absence of the said expression would certainly vitiate the order of detention as held in 2005 [1] CTC 577 [cited supra]. Therefore, the subjective satisfaction arrived at by the detaining authority that if the detenu is released on bail, he will indulge in similar activities that are prejudicial to the maintenance of public order, would be a mere ipse dixit and that would vitiate the order of detention and the same is indicative of total non-application of mind on the part of the Detaining Authority. Therefore, the impugned order is passed on mere Ipse-dixit and the order of detention cannot be sustained in the eye of law.

7. In this connection it is useful to refer the judgment of the Hon''ble Apex Court relied on by the learned counsel for the petitioner.

[a] In T.V. Saravanan @ S.A.R. Prasana Venkatachaariar Chaturvedi Vs. State through Secretary and Another, AIR 2006 SC 1462 : (2006) CriLJ 1619 : (2006) 2 JT 433 : (2006) 2 SCALE 358 : (2006) 2 SCC 664 : (2006) 1 UJ 598 : (2006) AIRSCW 2849 : (2006) 4 Supreme 578 , wherein the Hon''ble Apex Court has held as follows:

"The Courts had rejected the bail applications moved by the appellant and there was no material whatsoever to apprehend that he was likely to move a bail application or that there was imminent possibility of the prayer for bail being granted. The "imminent possibility" of the appellant coming out on bail is mere ipse dixit of the detaining authority unsupported by any material whatsoever. There was no cogent material before the detaining authority on the basis of which the detaining authority could be satisfied that the detenu was likely to be released on bail. The inference has to be drawn from the available material on record, in the absence of such material on record, the mere ipse dixit of the detaining authority is not sufficient to sustain the order of detention."

[b] In Velumurugan @ Velu Vs. The Commissioner of Police and Another, (2005) 1 CTC 577 , it has been held by the Division Bench of this Court as follows:

"3. It is settled law as laid down by the Supreme Court in the decisions Kamarunnissa and Others Vs. Union of India and another, AIR 1991 SC 1640 : (1991) CriLJ 2058 : (1991) 1 Crimes 131 : (1990) 4 JT 7 : (1990) 2 SCALE 485 : (1991) 1 SCC 128 : (1990) 1 SCR 457 Supp and Rivadeneyta Ricardo Augustin V. Government of Delhi, 1994 Supp. [1] SCC 597 : 1994 SCC [Cri.] 354; that unless there is a clear expression by the detaining authority in the grounds of detention with reference to the imminent possibility of the detenu being released on bail by filing bail application, the detaining authority would not choose to pass the detention order. In order to prevent the detenu from committing the acts, which would be disturbance to public order and public health, the detaining authority shall consider the materials and on the basis of subjective satisfaction that there is imminent possibility of the detenu coming out on bail or likelihood of

the detenu being released on bail, the detaining authority may pass such an order under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. When such an essential requirement, namely, the imminent possibility of the detenu coming out on bail, is absent, it has to be held that the order of detention is vitiated.

4. On going through the relevant paragraph of the grounds of detention, we only notice that there is a mere reference of the possibility of the detenu coming out on bail. Admittedly, the expression, in explicit terms about the imminent possibility of the detenu coming out on bail, is absent. In the absence of such expression in the grounds of detention, we are to conclude that the impugned order of detention is liable to be set aside."

[emphasis supplied]

[c] In Huidrom Konungjao Singh Vs. State of Manipur and Others, AIR 2012 SC 2002 : (2012) CriLJ 2935 : (2012) 5 SCALE 628 : (2012) 7 SCC 181 : (2012) AIRSCW 3043 : (2012) 4 Supreme 151 which reads thus:-

12. In Rekha Vs. State of T. Nadu tr. Sec. to Govt. and Another, (2011) 3 CTC 222 : (2011) 4 JT 392 : (2011) 2 RCR(Criminal) 527 : (2011) 4 SCALE 387 : (2011) 5 SCC 244 : (2011) 4 SCR 740 : (2011) 3 SCR 885 , this Court while dealing with the issue held :

"...A mere ipse dixit statement in the grounds of detention cannot sustain the detention order and has to be ignored....

14. Thus, as the detenu in the instant case has not moved the bail application and no other co-accused, if any, had been enlarged on bail, resorting to the provisions of Act was not permissible. Therefore, the impugned order of detention is based on mere ipse dixit statement in the grounds of detention and cannot be sustained in the eyes of law."

8. It is a trite law that personal liberty protected under Article 21 is so sacrosanct and so high in the scale of Constitutional values that it is the obligation of the detaining authority to show that the impugned detention meticulously accords with the procedure established by law. Preventive detention is preventive and not punitive. When ordinary law of the land is sufficient to deal with, taking recourse to the preventive detention law is illegal.

9. In the light of the above facts and law, we have no hesitation in quashing the order of detention on the above mentioned grounds.

10. Accordingly, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the impugned detention order passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, is directed to be released forthwith unless his presence is required in connection with any other case.