

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 14.07.2015

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE DR.JUSTICE S.TAMILVANAN
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.T.SELVAM

H.C.P.No.287/2015

Jothi

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.State of Tamilnadu
rep. by The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai-600 009.

2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Namakkal District.

... Respondents

Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records pertaining to the detention order passed in CMP. No.3/Goonda/2015/M1 dated 14.01.2014 on the file of the second respondent herein and to set aside the same and to direct the respondents herein to produce the detenu Dhanraj, S/o.Ramu, aged about 28 years, who is confined in Central Prison, Salem, before this Court and to set him at liberty.

For petitioner : Ms.L.Srilekha

For respondents : Mr.M.Maharaja
Additional Public Prosecutor

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 CMP. No.3/Goonda/2015/M1 dated 14.01.2014, whereby the detenu/husband of the petitioner by name, Dhanraj, S/o.Ramu, aged about 28 years, was ordered to be detained under the provisions of Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral

Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Slum-grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 (Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982) branding him as a "GOONDA".

2. Though many grounds have been raised in the petition, Ms.L.Srilekha, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, confines her 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 though the detenu has been formally arrested and remanded to judicial custody in the 1st adverse case in Cr.No.523/2014 registered by the Tiruchengode Police Station, the said factum of the remand of the detenu in the 1st adverse case in Cr.No.523/2014 has not been reflected in the grounds of detention, more particularly in paragraph 4 of the Detention order. This is indicative of the non-application of mind on the part of the Detaining Authority and hence, submitted that the detention order is vitiated 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 and citation.

6.As could be evidenced from the grounds of detention, the detenu was arrested in the 1st adverse case in Cr.No.523/2014 registered by the Tiruchengode Police Station. But the factum of remand of the detenu in the 1st adverse case in Crime No.523/2014 has not been reflected in paragraph 4 of the Grounds of Detention and only a reference has been made in respect of the ground case in which the detenu is in remand. When nothing has been stated about the remand of the detenu in the said 1st adverse case, it is not known whether the detenu has filed any bail application in the said 1st adverse case or not. If that be so, there is no imminent possibility of the detenu coming out on bail in the said adverse case. Hence, the Detaining Authority has passed the Detention order in total non-application of mind which would vitiate the detention order.

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 grounds.

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//

Sub Assistant Registrar

vga

To

1. State of Tamilnadu
rep. by The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai-600 009.
2. The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Namakkal District.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.
4. The Superintendent of Central Prison,
Salem.
5. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public(Law & Order),
Fort Saint George, Chennai - 9.

AK(CO)
CA(05/08/2015)

H.C.P.No.287/2015