

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 28.09.2015

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE DR. JUSTICE S.TAMILVANAN
and

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE C.T.SELVAM

H.C.P.No.1876/2015

Sathish Kumar

...Petitioner

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by its Secretary to Government,
Department of Food and Consumer Production
2nd Floor, Namakkal Kavingar Maligai,
Chennai-600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Chennai City Police,
Commissioner Office, Egmore,
Chennai-600 008.
3. The Secretary to Government,
Ministry of Consumer Affairs,
Food and Public Distribution,
(Department of Consumer Affairs)
Room No.270, Krishi Bhavan,
New Delhi-110 001.
4. The Inspector of Police,
Civil Supplies C.I.D.,
Chennai Unit,
Chennai.

...Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ of habeas corpus calling for the records in connection with the order No.406/2015 dated 23.05.2015 on the file of the 2nd respondent herein against the petitioner's father and quash the same as illegal and direct

the respondents to produce the detenu/petitioner's father, namely, Rupan @ Rupalingam, son of Subramani aged about 54 years, now confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Court and set him at liberty to secure the ends of justice.

For Petitioner : Mr.Ilayaraja Kandasamy

For RR 1,2 & 4 : Mr.M.Maharaja,APP
Mr.S.Arockiam
Central Govt.
Standing Counsel for R3

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by S.TAMILVANAN, J.]

Challenge is made to the order of detention passed by the second respondent vide Proceedings in No.406/2015 dated 23.05.2015, whereby the detenu/the father of the petitioner, by name, Rupan @ Rupalingam, son of Subramani, aged 54 years, was ordered to be detained under the provisions of the Black Marketing and Maintenance of Supplies of Essential Commodities Act 1980, (Act No.7 of 1980), branding him as a "BLACK MARKETEER".

2.Though many grounds have been raised in the petition, Mr.Ilayaraja Kandasamy, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, confines his argument only in respect of non-application of mind on the part of the detaining authority in passing the order of detention.

3.Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that page Nos.13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 and certain other pages in the booklet furnished to the detenu are illegible and could not be read at all. This illegible copies would deprive the detenu of making effective representation to the authorities against the order of detention. Thus, the detention order is vitiated on these grounds and the same is liable to be quashed.

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.

6.A perusal of the booklet supplied to the detenu would show that the copies of documents referred and relied upon and referred to by the Detaining Authority, in particular, page Nos.13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, etc., are illegible and are totally unreadable. This has resulted in the detenu being deprived of making an effective representation. Therefore, the detention order is vitiated and liable to be quashed on this ground alone.

7.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.

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

9. 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.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar (CS-IV)

//True Copy//

सत्यमेव जयते
Sub Assistant Registrar

kal

WEB COPY

To

1. The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by its Secretary to Government,
Department of Food and Consumer Production
2nd Floor, Namakkal Kavingar Maligai,
Chennai-600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Chennai City Police,
Commissioner Office, Egmore,
Chennai-600 008.
3. The Secretary to Government,
Ministry of Consumer Affairs,
Food and Public Distribution,
(Department of Consumer Affairs)
Room No.270, Krishi Bhavan,
New Delhi-110 001.
4. The Inspector of Police,
Civil Supplies C.I.D.,
Chennai Unit,
Chennai.
5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.
6. The Superintendent of Central Prison
Puzhal, Chennai.

1 CC to Mr.S.Arockiam, Advocate SR.No. 52533

सत्यमेव जयते

H.C.P.No.1876/2015

EV (CO)

PSI (15.10.2015)

WEB COPY