

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH
AT SRINAGAR**

Reserved on: 09.04.2026

Pronounced on: 08.05.2026

Uploaded on: 08.05.2026

*Whether the operative part
or full judgment is
pronounced: **Full***

HCP No.85/2025

AKASH AHMAD LONE

...PETITIONER(S)

Through: - Mr. G. N. Shaheen, Advocate.

Vs.

UT OF J&K & ORS.

...RESPONDENT(S)

Through: - Mr. Furqan Yaqub, GA.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY DHAR, JUDGE

JUDGMENT

1) The petitioner has challenged detention order No.14/DMP/PSA/25 dated 30.04.2025, issued by District Magistrate, Pulwama-respondent No.2. In terms of the aforesaid order, **Akash Ahmad Lone** ("the detenu") has been placed under preventive detention in order to prevent him from indulging in the activities which are prejudicial to the maintenance of security of the State.

2) The petitioner has contended that the allegations/the grounds of detention are vague and mere assertions, on the basis of which no prudent man can make an effective representation. It has been contended that these allegations

mentioned in the grounds of detention have no nexus with the detinue and that the same have been fabricated by the police in order to justify its illegal action of detaining the detinue. It has been contended that the procedural safeguards have not been complied with in the instant case, inasmuch as whole of the material which formed basis of the impugned detention order has not been supplied to the petitioner.

3) The respondents have filed reply affidavit, wherein they have contended that the activities of detinue are highly prejudicial to the security of the State. It is pleaded that whole of the material relied upon by the detaining authority has been furnished to the detinue and contents of the same were read over and explained to him. It is further contented in the reply affidavit that all statutory requirements and constitutional guarantees have been fulfilled and complied with by the detaining authority and that the impugned order has been issued validly and legally. The respondents have produced the detention record to lend support to the stand taken in the counter affidavit.

4) I have heard learned counsel for parties and perused the record.

5) Learned counsel for the petitioner, while seeking quashment of the impugned order, has projected various

grounds including the ground that the entire material forming basis of the grounds of detention has not been supplied to the detenu which has prevented him from making an effective representation against the impugned order of detention. It has also been contended that the allegations made in the grounds of detention are vague lacking in material particulars and on the basis of said allegations it was not possible for the detenu to make an effective representation against the order of detention. Lastly, it has been argued that the representation made against the impugned order of detention has not been decided by the respondents.

6) So far as the first ground urged by learned counsel for the petitioner is concerned, in this regard a perusal of the detention record would reveal that the petitioner has executed a receipt on 01.05.2025 which indicates that he has received ten leaves comprising copy of warrant (01 leaf), notice of detention (01 leaf), grounds of detention (02 leaves), dossier (02 leaves), copies of complaints (03 leaves) and beat report (01 leaf). In the grounds of detention, the detaining authority has relied upon the complaint made against the petitioner for binding him down in terms of Section 126 of BNSS. Copy of the same seems to have been received by the petitioner. The other relevant documents like warrant of detention, copy of dossier and grounds of detention have also been received by

the petitioner. Even the copy of the beat report, which has been relied upon by the detaining authority, has been furnished to the petitioner. Thus, the petitioner cannot contend that the entire material has not been furnished to him. The ground urged in this regard is not borne out from the detention record.

7) In regard to second contention of learned counsel for the petitioner, if we have a look at the grounds of detention, it is clearly mentioned therein that the petitioner had worked as OGW of a militant, namely Yasir Parray and in the year 2023, the said militant, with the help of Pakistani handler, namely, Ilyas Pankistan, was going to bring weapons in his truck from Gurdaspur Punjab. It is alleged that the petitioner was rendering assistance and logistic support to the above-named militant for his terrorist activities by providing him food, shelter and information about the movement of police/security forces. Thus, it is not a case where the grounds of detention do not contain any specific allegations against the petitioner. As already stated, the grounds of detention clearly indicate the name of the militant with whom the petitioner was having links and to whom he was providing logistic support. In these circumstances, the contention of the petitioner that the allegations made in the grounds of detention are vague, is misconceived.

8) It has been further contended that the representation made by the petitioner against the impugned order of detention has not been considered by the respondents. However, in the petition it has been submitted that the petitioner could not make a representation as the requisite facilities were not provided to him by the jail authorities. Thus, the ground urged by learned counsel for the petitioner is contrary to the pleadings of the petitioner. The contention in this regard is, therefore, without any merit and is liable to be rejected.

9) For the foregoing reasons, I do not find any ground to interfere with the impugned order of detention. The petition lacks merit and is dismissed accordingly.

10) The detention record be returned to learned counsel for the respondents.

(Sanjay Dhar)
Judge

Srinagar

08.05.2026

“Bhat Altaf-Szeg”

Whether the **Judgment** is reportable: **YES/NO**