



2026:KER:54626

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. SOUMEN SEN

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SYAM KUMAR V.M.

WEDNESDAY, THE 22ND DAY OF JULY 2026 / 31ST ASHADHA, 1948

WP(CRL.) NO. 753 OF 2026

PETITIONER:

LAMIYA A. P., AGED 28 YEARS
W/O. SHIJU @ TINKU VAIKUNDAM (H), MUTHAPPANPARA ROAD,
NEAR MVD OFFICE, CHEVAYUR, KOZHIKODE, PIN - 673017.

BY ADVS. SRI.RENJITH B.MARAR
SMT.LAKSHMI.N.KAIMAL
SRI.P.RAJKUMAR
SRI.KESHAVRAJ NAIR
SRI.BIJU VIGNESWAR
SRI.ARUN POOMULLI
SRI.ABHIRAM.S.
SMT.GAADHA SURESH
SRI.AKSHAY SHIBU
SRI.ANANTHAPADMANABHAN
SRI.ASHISH PAUL
SMT.LAXMISREE JAYANTHA KUMAR
SRI.MURALI KRISHNA PRASAD

RESPONDENTS:

- 1 STATE OF KERALA
REPRESENTED BY THE CHIEF SECRETARY, SECRETARIAT,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM,, PIN - 695001.
- 2 THE ADDITIONAL CHIEF SECRETARY
HOME DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695001.



- 3 THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR AND THE DISTRICT MAGISTRATE
KOZHIKOD, CIVIL STATION, WAYANAD RD, ERANHIPPALAM,
KOZHIKODE, PIN - 673020.
- 4 THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF POLICE
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF POLICE
KOZHIKODE, PIN - 673601.

BY SENIOR PUBLIC PROSECUTOR SRI. BIJU MEENATTOOR

THIS WRIT PETITION (CRIMINAL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
21.07.2026, THE COURT ON 22.07.2026 DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:



SOUMEN SEN, C. J. & SYAM KUMAR V. M., J.

=====

W.P(Crl) No.753 of 2026

=====

Dated this the 22nd day of July, 2026

J U D G M E N T

Soumen Sen, C.J.

1. The detenu is presently undergoing preventive detention under the Kerala Anti-Social Activities (Prevention) Act, 2007 [‘the KAA(P)A’, for short]. The detenu has been classified as a ‘known rowdy’ within the meaning of Section 2(p) of the Act. Admittedly, the classification of the detenu as ‘known rowdy’ is not under any doubt. The detenu has antecedents of committing various offences and out of four detention orders passed in exercise of power under Section 3(1) of the KAA(P)A in the years 2009, 2013, 2018 and 2022, he underwent detention for a period of six months in respect of the second order, and the other orders of detention were revoked. After release of the last detention, he was involved in a crime, being Crime No.1037 of 2025



of Chevayur Police Station under Sections 126(2), 118(1), 118(2) and 109(1) read with Section 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 ('BNS', for short).

2. The allegation is that on 6th December, 2025, the detenu and the co-accused had brutally assaulted the complainant using deadly weapons in connection with a dispute causing severe injuries to the various parts of the body.
3. On 1st January, 2026 the alleged detenu filed an application for bail which was dismissed on that date. On 7th January, 2026, the Inspector of Police, Kunnamangalam Police Station, Kozhikode proposed for detention under Section 3 of the KAA(P)A. Following the said request, an order of detention was passed on 17th February, 2026 under Sections 3(1) and 13(2) of the KAA(P)A against the alleged detenu. The bail application filed on 20th February, 2026 was dismissed. The present petitioner made a representation to the Government on



25th February, 2026. The Government forwarded the representation to the Advisory Board for consideration on 28th February, 2026. The Advisory Board after giving an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner filed a report on 31st March, 2026 recommending preventive detention. On 6th April, 2026 the representation filed by the petitioner on 25th February, 2026 was considered and the order of detention was upheld.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the order of detention is challenged on the limited ground of non-consideration of the representation of the petitioner dated 25th February, 2026 within a reasonable time. It is submitted that in view of Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India, such representation is required to be considered by the Government as expeditiously as possible and under no stretch of imagination, it can be contended and held that almost 37 days could be reasonable enough to consider such representation.



5. The learned counsel has referred to the decision of this Court in ***Kumari A.V. v. State of Kerala***¹ in which the Constitution Bench decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Pankaj Kumar Chakrabarty v. State of West Bengal***² was relied upon.
6. It is submitted that the said judgment has held on proper appreciation of clause (5) of Article 22 that the representation is required to be considered at the earliest having regard to the words used in clause (5) of Article 22 of the Constitution of India, namely, 'shall afford him the earliest of making a representation against the order'. It is submitted that having regard to the nature of the order passed in such proceeding, it is incumbent upon the State authorities to scrupulously follow the mandate of the Constitution and the very fact that there is a delay of almost 37 days, the order of detention is required to be set aside.

1 2024 KHC Online 646

2 (1969) 3 SCC 400



7. The learned Senior Public Prosecutor has submitted that in the statement of facts, the events has been chronologically mentioned and there has been no delay and laches on the part of the respondent-State in considering and disposing of the representations.
8. We have directed the State to produce the original file for the purpose of proper and better appreciation of the arguments made on behalf of the parties. We have perused the file. It appears that the petitioner has made two separate representations. The first representation was made to the Government on 25th February, 2026. The other representation was made to the Advisory Board on the same date. Section 7(2) permits an alleged detenu to make separate representations to the Government and the Advisory Board against the order of detention. However, it appears that the matter was referred to the Advisory Board on 28th February, 2026 and the Advisory Board has given its opinion on 31st March, 2026. It is only thereafter that



the State Government has considered and disposed the representation on 6th April, 2026, confirming the order of detention.

9. The argument put forth on behalf of the petitioner appears to be that the detaining authority ought to have considered the representation independent of any opinion that the Advisory Board may form and there is an unexplained delay in considering such representation by the State Government.
10. The learned counsel referred to the decision of the Coordinate Bench of this Court in ***Kumari A.V.*** (*supra*), wherein another Division Bench, after considering the Constitution Bench decision in ***Pankaj Kumar*** (*supra*), observed that the Government must act independently and that there exists no mandate requiring the Government to wait for the decision of the Advisory Board.



11. If the reason for the Government's decision was to await the decision of the Advisory Board, it would fall foul of the mandate under clause (5) of Article 22 of the Constitution of India.
12. In the statement of facts, the Government has not explained the reason for the delay of 37 days in not considering the said representation.
13. The learned counsel for the petitioner has strenuously argued that the said representation is required to be considered as expeditiously as possible, as it impinges upon the liberty of a person, detained without trial. Article 22(5) has been referred to emphasise the requirement of an urgent consideration of the representation filed by or on behalf of the detenu.
14. Section 7(2) of the KAA(P)A gives a right to the detenu to make a representation before the Detaining Authority as well as the Advisory Board. The procedure to be adopted



by the Advisory Board in considering and deferring of such representation is mentioned in Section 10 of the KAA(P)A. There is no specific provision in the KAA(P)A that mandates the Government to dispose of such representation within a specified period or before or after the disposal of the representation by the Advisory Board. Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India also does not mention any time period within which the representation, if made, is required to be disposed of by the Government, wherein Article 22(4), it has been stated that no law providing for preventive detention shall authorise the detention of a person for a longer period than 3 months unless the circumstances mentioned in the said sub-clause are fulfilled.

15. KAA(P)A is an enactment, specifically designed to provide for the effective prevention and control of certain kind of anti-social activities in the State of Kerala. In the instant case, all the timelines required at every stage of such



proceeding culminating in an order of detention has been followed. There is no time limit prescribed in the KAA(P)A for the Government to consider his representation under Section 7(2) of the KAA(P)A. Similarly, no timeline is prescribed for the Advisory Board to conclude the proceeding. However, having regard to the serious consequence a person suffered by reason of preventive detention, the constitutional courts have time and again reiterated that every process should be completed within a reasonable time and there should not be not be any inordinate delay in concluding the proceeding. The law as it stands appears to be that unexplained delay in initiating the detention proceeding or in disposing of the representation may result in violation of Article 21 of the Constitution of India. In the instant case, the petitioner has filed representation both before the Government and the Advisory Board. The Advisory Board considered and disposed of the representation on 31st March, 2026.



However, the Government passed an order on 6th April, 2026, where from it appears that the Government, while independently considering the representation dated 25th February, 2026, also accepted the recommendation of the Advisory Board. This order is under challenge on the ground that apart from the delay in disposing of the representation, there is no separate consideration of the representation on merits.

16. The order, on the face of it, appears to be an order where both aspects of the matter was considered. While paragraphs 1 to 4 had dealt with the representation on merits, 5th paragraph is the consideration of the opinion of the Advisory Board recommending detention.

17. In the statement of facts, the Government has not explained the reason for considering the representation on 6th April, 2026 along with the report of the Advisory Board dated 31st March, 2026. It can be well presumed that the Government wanted to decide both the matters, namely



the representation made and the report of the Advisory Board together. There is a delay of only five days in considering the report of the Advisory Board. However, no separate order has been passed by the Government on the representation and acceptance of the recommendation of the Advisory Board.

18. The learned counsel has strongly relied upon the decision of a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in ***Kumari A.V.*** (*supra*) and has submitted that the said decision has clearly cast an obligation upon the Government to independently consider the representation and not to wait for the decision of the Advisory Board. The learned counsel has specifically referred to paragraphs 15 and 16 of the said judgment in support of his submission, wherein it is stated as follows;

“15. The question is whether the Government was legally obliged to independently consider the representation before forwarding the files to the Advisory Board.

a) S.7 of KAAPA reads as under:



S.7. Grounds of detention shall be disclosed.

(i) When a person is arrested in pursuance of a detention order, the officer arresting him shall read out the detention order to him and give him a copy of such order.

(ii) The grounds of detention, specifying the instances of offences, with copies of relevant documents, as far as practicable, on the basis of which he is considered as a "known goonda" or "known rowdy" and giving such materials relating to his activities on the basis of which his detention has been found necessary, shall be furnished to him as soon as possible nevertheless, in any case, within five days of detention and he shall also be informed in writing, under acknowledgement, of his right to represent to the Government and before the Advisory Board against his detention:

Provided that nothing in this section shall require any authority to disclose to the detained person any fact, the disclosure of which will reveal the identity of any confidential source or the disclosure of which will be against the interests of internal security or national security.

(iii) The Superintendent of the Jail where such person is detained shall afford him reasonable opportunity to consult a lawyer and reasonable assistance in making a representation against the detention order to the Government or to the Advisory Board.

(iv) The order of detention shall not be deemed to be invalid merely because one or more of the facts or circumstances cited among the grounds are vague, non-existent, irrelevant or invalid for any reason whatsoever and such order shall be deemed to have been made by the Government or the Authorised officer



after having been satisfied about the need for detention with reference to the remaining facts and circumstances, provided that the minimum conditions for being classified as a known goonda or known rowdy are satisfied.

Sub-section (2) clearly says that the grounds for detention, detailing specific instances of offenses and including copies of relevant documents, must be provided to the detainee as soon as possible, but no later than five days after the detention. The detainee must be informed in writing of their right to make a representation to the Government and the Advisory Board against their detention. Sub-section (3) says that the Superintendent of the Jail where the detainee is held must provide reasonable opportunities for the detainee to consult a lawyer. The detainee must be given reasonable assistance in making a representation against the detention order to the Government or the Advisory Board.

*b) In **Pramod Singla v Union of India**, (2023 SCC OnLine SC 374) a Division Bench of the Apex Court had occasion to consider whether there is any conflict between the principles of law laid down in **K.M. Abdulla Kunhi & B.L. Abdul Khader v. Union Of India**, (1991 (1) SCC 476) and **Ankit Ashok Jalan v. Union Of India**, [2020 (16) SCC 127] both of which are Constitution Bench judgments, which state that the Central Government must wait for the decision of the Advisory Board, with the Constitution Bench judgments of the Apex Court in **Pankaj Kumar Chakrabarty v. State of West Bengal**, [1969 (3) SCC 400] and the **Jayanarayan Sukul v. State of West Bengal**, [1970 (1) SCC 219]. After considering the ratio of the law laid down in the judgments it was held that there is no friction between the judgments. The Apex*



Court held that the detention order under both laws can be passed either by the Government or by the specially empowered officer. However, under S.3 of the Preventive Detention Act, the specially empowered officer, within 12 days of the detention, has to seek for approval from the Government for continued detention, and only if the Government approves the same can the detention be continued. This process of seeking approval from the Government is essentially a transfer of power from the empowered officer to the Government, making the Government the detaining authority after the initial lapse of 12 days. In the COFEPOSA Act however, no such approval is required from the Government, and hence the detaining authority and the Government remain to be two separate bodies independent of each other. The provisions of the Preventive Detention Act, 1980 is in pari materia the provisions of the KAAPA. **K.M. Abdulla Kunhi** (supra) was rendered in the context of the COFEPOSA Act. In that view of the matter, the principles laid down in **Pankaj Kumar Chakrabarty** (supra) and **Jayanarayan Sukul** (supra), would squarely apply. In **Pankaj Kumar** (supra), after careful consideration, a Constitution Bench of this Court held that the Government must act independently from the Advisory Board and that there exists no mandate on the Government to wait for the decision of the Advisory Board. The relevant paragraphs of the said judgment are being extracted herein:

10. "It is true that clause (5) does not in positive language provide as to whom the representation is to be made and by whom, when made, it is to be considered. But the expressions "as soon as may be" and "the earliest opportunity" in that clause clearly indicate that the grounds are to be served and the



opportunity to make a representation are provided for to enable the detenu to show that his detention is unwarranted and since no other authority who should consider such representation is mentioned it can only be the detaining authority to whom it is to be made which has to consider it. Though clause (5) does not in express terms say so it follows from its provisions that it is the detaining authority which has to give to the detenu the earliest opportunity to make a representation and to consider it when so made whether its order is wrongful or contrary to the law enabling it to detain him. The illustrations given in Abdul Karim case [Abdul Karim v. State of W.B., 1969 (1) SCC 433] show that clause (5) of Art.22 not only contains the obligation of the appropriate Government to furnish the grounds and to give the earliest opportunity to make a representation but also by necessary implication the obligation to consider that representation. Such an obligation is evidently provided for to give an opportunity to the detenu to show and a corresponding opportunity to the appropriate Government to consider any objections against the order which the detenu may raise so that no person is, through error or otherwise, wrongly arrested and detained. If it was intended that such a representation need not be considered by the Government where an Advisory Board is constituted and that representation in such cases is to be considered by the Board and not by the appropriate Government, clause (5) would not have directed the detaining authority to afford the earliest opportunity to the detenu. In that case the words would more appropriately have been that the authority should obtain the opinion of the Board after giving an opportunity to the detenu to make a representation and communicate the same to the Board. But what would



happen in cases where the detention is for less than 3 months and there is no necessity of having the opinion of the Board? If counsel's contention were to be right the representation in such cases would not have to be considered either by the appropriate Government or by the Board and the right of representation and the corresponding obligation of the appropriate Government to give the earliest opportunity to make such representation would be rendered nugatory. In imposing the obligation to afford the opportunity to make a representation, clause (5) does not make any distinction between orders of detention for only 3 months or less and those for a longer duration. The obligation applies to both kinds of orders. The clause does not say that the representation is to be considered by the appropriate Government in the former class of cases and by the Board in the latter class of cases. In our view it is clear from clauses (4) and (5) of Art.22 that there is a dual obligation on the appropriate Government and a dual right in favour of the detenu, namely, (1) to have his representation irrespective of the length of detention considered by the appropriate Government and (2) to have once again that representation in the light of the circumstances of the case considered by the Board before it gives its opinion. If in the light of that representation the Board finds that there is no sufficient cause for detention the Government has to revoke the order of detention and set at liberty the detenu. Thus, whereas the Government considers the representation to ascertain whether the order is in conformity with its power under the relevant law, the Board considers such representation from the point of view of arriving at its opinion whether there is sufficient cause for detention. The obligation of the appropriate Government to afford to the detenu the opportunity to make a representation



and to consider that representation is distinct from the Government's obligation to constitute a Board and to communicate the representation amongst other materials to the Board to enable it to form its opinion and to obtain such opinion.

11. This conclusion is strengthened by the other provisions of the Act. In conformity with clauses (4) and (5) of Art.22, S.7 of the Act enjoins upon the detaining authority to furnish to the detenu grounds of detention within five days from the date of his detention and to afford to the detenu the earliest opportunity to make his representation to the appropriate Government. S.8 and S.9 enjoin upon the appropriate Government to constitute an Advisory Board and to place within 30 days from the date of the detention the grounds for detention, the detenu's representation and also the report of the officer where the order of detention is made by an officer and not by the Government. The obligation under S.7 is quite distinct from that under S.8 and S.9. If the representation was for the consideration not by the Government but by the Board only as contended, there was no necessity to provide that it should be addressed to the Government and not directly to the Board. The Government could not have been intended to be only a transmitting authority nor could it have been contemplated that it should sit tight on that representation and remit it to the Board after it is constituted. The peremptory language in clause (5) of Art.22 and S.7 of the Act would not have been necessary if the Board and not the Government had to consider the representation. S.13 also furnishes an answer to the argument of the counsel for the State. Under that section, the State Government and the Central Government are empowered to revoke or modify an order of detention. That power is evidently provided for to enable the Government to take



appropriate action where on a representation made to it, it finds that the order in question should be modified or even revoked. Obviously, the intention of Parliament could not have been that the appropriate Government should pass an order under S.13 without considering the representation which has under S.7 been addressed to it.

12. For the reasons aforesaid we are in agreement with the decision in Abdul Karim case [Abdul Karim v. State of W.B., 1969 (1) SCC 433]. Consequently, the petitioners had a Constitutional right and there was on the State Government a corresponding Constitutional obligation to consider their representations irrespective of whether they were made before or after their cases were referred to the Advisory Board and that not having been done the order of detention against them cannot be sustained. In this view it is not necessary for us to examine the other objections raised against these orders. The petition is therefore allowed, the orders of detention against Petitioners 15 and 36 are set aside and we direct that they should be set at liberty forthwith."

*c) In **Haradhan Saha** (supra), yet another Constitution Bench of the Apex Court considered the distinction between the consideration of the representation made by the detenu in cases of preventive detention, and it was stated that if the representation was made before the matter is referred to the Advisory Board, the detaining authority must consider such representation, but if the representation is made after the matter is referred to the Advisory Board, the detaining authority would first consider it and then send it to the Advisory Board. It was held as under:*

29. Principles of natural justice are an element in considering the reasonableness of a restriction where



Art.19 is applicable. At the stage of consideration of representation by the State Government, the obligation of the State Government is such as Art.22(5) implies. S.8 of the Act is in complete conformity with Art.22(5) because this section follows the provisions of the Constitution. If the representation of the detenu is received before the matter is referred to the Advisory Board, the detaining authority considers the representation. If a representation is made after the matter has been referred to the Advisory Board, the detaining authority will consider it before it will send representation to the Advisory Board."

d) The Apex Court has held that representation submitted by the detenu relates to the liberty of the individual, the highly cherished right enshrined in Art.21 of our Constitution. Clause (5) of Art.22 therefore, casts a legal obligation on the government to consider the representation as early as possible. The words "as soon as may be" occurring in clause (5) of Art.22 reflect the concern of the Framers that the representation should be expeditiously considered and disposed of with a sense of urgency without an avoidable delay. Though there is no period prescribed either under the Constitution or under the concerned detention law, within which the representation should be dealt with, there shall not be any supine indifference or slackness in considering the representation. Any unexplained delay in the disposal of representation would be a breach of the constitutional imperative and it would render the continued detention impermissible and illegal. This is because the confirmation of detention does not preclude the government from revoking the order of detention upon considering the representation. Secondly, there may be cases where the government has to consider the representation only after



confirmation of detention. Clause (5) of Art.22 suggests that the representation could be received even after confirmation of the order of detention. The words 'shall afford him the earliest opportunity of making a representation against the order' in clause (5) of Art.22 suggest that the obligation of the government is to offer the detenu an opportunity to make a representation against the order before it is confirmed according to the procedure laid down under the relevant statutory provisions."

16. In view of the principles laid down above, the Government was legally obliged to consider the representation expeditiously before forwarding the documents to the advisory board. We are of the view that the rights of the detenu guaranteed under Art.22(5) of the Constitution has been violated."

19. Before we refer to the said paragraphs, the facts summarized in paragraph 14 of the said judgment is important. In the aforesaid case, the detention order was passed on 16th February, 2024 and the detenu was arrested on 18th February, 2024. Detenu was arrested on 18th May, 2024. The detenu had submitted independent representations before the Government as well as the Advisory Board on 27th May, 2024 and on that date itself a writ petition was filed seeking issuance of a habeas



corpus. The Advisory Board considered the matter on 19th June, 2024 during the pendency of the writ petition. On 04th June, 2024 the Government referred the matter to the Advisory Board and the Advisory Board passed an order on 20th June, 2024 confirming the order of detention. The representation filed by the detenu on 27th May, 2024 was considered by the Government on 18th July, 2024, almost a month after the date on which the order was confirmed by the Advisory Board. The question that arose for consideration was whether the Government was legally obliged to independently consider the representation before forwarding the files to the Advisory Board. This was answered in favour of the writ petitioner and against the Government. The Co-ordinate Bench of this Court has dealt with and answered the said issue in paragraphs 15 and 16 of the said judgment alluded to above.

20. It would appear from the said paragraphs that reliance is placed on ***Pankaj Kumar Chakrabarty*** (*supra*), in which



it has been held that the Government must act independently from the Advisory Board and that there exists no mandate on the Government to wait for the decision of the Advisory Board. The reason being that no other authority who should consider such a representation is mentioned in Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India and it can only thus be the Detaining Authority, to whom it is to be made, has to consider such representation.

21. There is a dual obligation on the appropriate Government and a dual right in favour of the detenu, namely, (1) to have his representation irrespective of the length of detention considered by the appropriate Government and (2) to have once again that representation in the light of the circumstances of the case considered by the Board before it gives its opinion. If in the light of that representation the Board finds that there is no sufficient cause for detention the Government has to revoke the order of detention and set at liberty the detenu. Thus,



whereas the Government considers the representation to ascertain whether the order is in conformity with its power under the relevant law, the Board considers such representation from the point of view of arriving at its opinion whether there is sufficient cause for detention. The obligation of the appropriate Government to afford to the detenu the opportunity to make a representation and to consider that representation is distinct from the Government's obligation to constitute a Board and to communicate the representation amongst other materials to the Board to enable it to form its opinion and to obtain such opinion. [See paragraph 10 of the decision in ***Pankaj Kumar Chakrabarty*** (*supra*)]

22. In brief, there is a constitutional obligation on the State to consider the representations of detainees, irrespective of whether such representation was made before or after the reference is made to the Advisory Board and in any event,



such representation cannot be kept pending till the Advisory Board decides the matter.

23. The detention order thus cannot be sustained in absence of any explanation offered by the State for not considering the said representation made simultaneously, but not considered separately and only after the Advisory Board forwarded its recommendation. It is quite evident that the Government was awaiting the report of the Advisory Board.

24. In view of the aforesaid, Exhibit-P1 order of detention is set aside. The writ petition is allowed.

25. The Superintendent of Central Prison, Kannur, is directed to release the detenu, Sri. Shiju M.P. @ Tinku, if his detention is not required in connection with any other case.

26. The Registry is directed to communicate this order to the Superintendent of Central Prison, Kannur, forthwith.



27. The records produced in the sealed cover shall be returned to the learned Senior Public Prosecutor forthwith.

28. We make it clear that we have not gone into the merits of the order of detention and set aside the order in view of procedural lapses infringing upon the constitutional right of the detenu.

Sd/-
**SOUMEN SEN,
CHIEF JUSTICE**

Sd/-
**SYAM KUMAR V. M.,
JUDGE**



APPENDIX OF WP(CRL.) NO. 753 OF 2026

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:-

- EXHIBIT P1 TRUE COPY OF THE DETENTION ORDER BEARING NO. DCKKD/336/2026-S2 DATED 17.02.2026, PASSED BY THE 3RD RESPONDENT.
- EXHIBIT P2 TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 25.02.2026 SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE 2ND RESPONDENT.
- EXHIBIT P3 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER BEARING NO. SSAA2/26/2026 – HOME DATED 27.02.2026 PASSED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT.
- EXHIBIT P4 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER BEARING NO. G.O.(RT)NO. 1290/2026/HOME DATED 06.04.2026 PASSED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT.
- EXHIBIT P5 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER NO. DCKKD/4853/2023-S2, DATED 03.06.2023 ISSUED BY THE 3RD RESPONDENT.
- EXHIBIT P6 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 20.02.2026 IN B. A. NO. 218/2026 PASSED BY THE DISTRICT AND SESSIONS COURT, KOZHIKODE.
- EXHIBIT P7 TRUE COPY OF THE GROUND FOR DETENTION DATED 17.02.2026 PASSED BY THE 3RD RESPONDENT AGAINST THE DETENUE ALONG WITH ENGLISH TRANSLATION.