

State Of U.P vs Shakeel Ahmed on 28 November, 1995

Equivalent citations: 1996 SCC (1) 337, JT 1995 (8) 561

Author: K. Ramaswamy

Bench: K. Ramaswamy, S.B Majmudar

PETITIONER:

STATE OF U.P.

Vs.

RESPONDENT:

SHAKEEL AHMED

DATE OF JUDGMENT 28/11/1995

BENCH:

RAMASWAMY, K.

BENCH:

RAMASWAMY, K.

MAJMUDAR S.B. (J)

CITATION:

1996 SCC (1) 337 JT 1995 (8) 561

1995 SCALE (6) 732

ACT:

HEADNOTE:

JUDGMENT:

O R D E R Though the respondent has been served, he does not appear either in person or through counsel. Notice is sufficient.

Leave granted.

The respondent was detained on July 31, 1989 under Section 3 [1] (iii) of the Conservation of Foreign Exchange and Prevention of Smuggling Activities Act. When he challenged the order of detention, the High Court in the impugned order dated July 25, 1990 made in W.P. No.2029 of 1990 set aside the order of detention on the ground that the delay in non-consideration of the

representation for one month, i.e., from February 20, 1990 to March 15, 1990, was not explained and also on the ground that copy of the report of the sponsoring authority had not been supplied to the detenu which violates Article 22 [5] of the Constitution. We are of the opinion that the High Court was not right in setting aside the order of detention on these grounds. It is not mandatory that the report of the sponsoring authority should be supplied to the detenu under Article 22 [5] of the Constitution. It is only a material furnished to the detaining authority. All the material on which reliance was place for order of detention was admittedly supplied to the detenu. In the facts and circumstances of this case, the delay in disposal of the representation of about 23 days also is not fatal.

Under these circumstances, the order of the High Court setting aside the detention order is clearly illegal. However, since the period has already expired, we do not think that it is a case warranting further detention of the respondent.

The appeal is accordingly disposed of.