

h
W.P(Crl.)No. 8 OF 2004
ITEM No.205
(Part-Heard)

Court No. 10

SECTION X
A/N MATTER

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Writ Petition(Crl.) No. 8/2004

STATE LEGAL AID COMMITTEE J&K

Petitioner (s)

VERSUS

STATE OF J.&K. & ORS.
(For Final Disposal)
(With Office Report)

Respondent (s)

Date : 05/11/2004 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARIJIT PASAYAT
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.H. KAPADIA

For Petitioner (s)Mr. P.V. Yogeswaran,Adv.
Mr. B.S. Billowria,Adv.

For Respondent (s)Ms. Neelam Singh,Adv.
Mr. Ravi Prakash Mehrotra,Adv.

Mr. Anis Suhrawardy,Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

The writ petition is disposed of in terms of the signed order.

(Neena Verma) (Vijay Aggarwal)
Court Master Court Master

Signed Reportable order is placed on the file.
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CRIMINAL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION (CRL.) NO.8 OF 2004

State Legal Aid Committee, J & K
...Petitioner

Versus

State of J & K and Ors.
...Respondents

O R D E R

ARIJIT PASAYAT, J:

Though several questions have been raised in this petition, it is not necessary to deal with them in detail as we find that there is no definite material to show that the requirements of Section 13 of the Jammu & Kashmir Public Safety Act, 1978 (in short the 'Act) requiring the grounds of order of detention to be disclosed/communicated to the person affected by the order has been complied with. Though, in the affidavit filed by the State, it has been stated that t

he contents of the warrants and grounds of detention were served, read over and explained to the assessee and he was informed about his right to make a representation against the detention, if he so desired, there is no material placed on record to substantiate this stand. It is stated in the affidavit that the detenu refused to receive copy of the detention order and also refused to put his signatures on the documents. The least the State could have done is to file an affidavit of the person who wanted to serve the relevant documents and an endorsement to the effect that there was refusal. Even the name of the official has not been indicated in the affidavit. That would have been sufficient to comply with the requirements of Section 13 of the Act.

Though a prayer for extension of time is made to file the details, we find that the currency of the detention order is expiring on 06.11.2004. Therefore, we do not accept the prayer for extension of time. Learned counsel for the State submitted that there is no bar on a fresh order of detention being passed. We do not express any opinion in this regard. In the present proceedings, the order of detention of the detenu is quashed. This, however, shall not stand in the way of such action being taken by the State and/or any authority in accordance with law.

The writ petition is, accordingly, disposed of.

.....J.

(ARIJIT PASAYAT)

.....J.

(S.H. KAPADIA)

New Delhi,
November 05, 2004.