

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 15.07.2015

CORAM

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

H.C.P.No.486/2015

Narayanan

.. Petitioner

Vs

1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Fort St George, Chennai 600 009.

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

.. Respondents

Prayer: Writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for a WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS calling for the records in C.M.P.No.6/B.L.A./C2/2015 dated 03.02.2015 in detaining the detenu under Tamil Nadu Act 14/1982 as "Bootlegger" and quash the same and further direct the respondents to produce the said detenu namely, Prakabaran, Son of Mookkan @ Narayanan, aged about 24 years, who is detained at Central Prison, Salem, before this Court and to set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Veerasekaran

For Respondents : Mr.M.Maharaja,
Addl. 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 C.M.P.No.6/B.L.A./C2/2015 dated 03.02.2015, whereby the son of the petitioner, by name, Mookkan @ Narayanan, aged about 24 years, was ordered to be detained under the provisions of the 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 "BOOTLEGGER".

2.Though many grounds have been raised in the petition, Mr.D.Veerasekaran, the 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 the detenu was remanded in the ground case in Crime No.650/2014 registered by P.E.W. Attur for the offence u/s.4(1)(aa), 4(1-A) of Tamil Nadu Prohibition Act and he has moved a bail application before the Principal Sessions Judge, Salem, in C.M.P.no.226/2015 and the same was dismissed on 23.01.2015. Thereafter, the detenu has moved a bail application before this Court and he was granted bail in the said case in CrI.O.P.No.2252/2015. But, he is yet to offer sureties as on the date of passing of the detention order. But, the Detaining Authority has arrived at the subjective satisfaction that there is a real possibility of the detenu coming out on bail in the said case, without relying upon any similar case. He adds that absence of mentioning any similar case would vitiate the order of detention. Hence, it is stated that the Detaining Authority has passed the impugned detention order in total non-application of mind.

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 seen from paragraph 4 of the grounds of detention, detenu was remanded in the ground case in Cr.No.650/2014 registered by P.E.W. Attur and he was granted bail in the said case in CrI.O.P.No.2252/2015 by this Court on 30.01.2015. But, he is yet to offer sureties as on the date of passing of the detention order. But, the Detaining Authority has arrived at the subjective satisfaction that there is a real possibility of the detenu coming out on bail in the said case, without relying upon any similar case. This would show that the Detaining Authority passed the order of detention mechanically and without application of mind and the facts do not justify the detention. Therefore, the impugned order is passed on mere Ipse-dixit and the order of detention cannot be sustained in the eye of law.

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.In the result, this Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The impugned detention order 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

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

kal

To

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Fort St George, Chennai 600 009.
- 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Salem 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 St. George, Chennai. 600 009.

1 cc to Mr. D. Veerasekaran, Advocate Sr.35811

H.C.P.No.486/2015

KSJ(CO)
Eu 18.08.15