



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 03.06.2015

CORAM

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

H.C.P.No.58/2015

Deivanai .. Petitioner/Nephew of the detenue

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu, rep. By its Secretary to Government,
[Home], Prohibition & Excise Department
Secretariat, Chennai-9.

2.The District Magistrate & District Collector
Salem District. .. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus directing the respondents to produce the body of the petitioner's son namely Matheswaran, son of Arumugam, aged about 55 years, who is detained in Central Prison, Salem, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith by calling for the records pursuant to the Detention order made in CMP No.28/BLA/C2/2014 dated 28.11.2014 under Act-14/1982 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same.

For petitioner	:	Mr.R.Nalliyappan
For respondents	:	Mr.M.Maharaja Additional Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

[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.28/BLA/C2/2014 dated 28.11.2014, whereby the son of the petitioner by name Matheswaran, son of Arumugam, aged about 55 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 "Bootlegger".

2.Though many grounds have been raised in the petition, Mr.R.Nalliyappan, 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 has been formally arrested and remanded to judicial custody in the 4th adverse case in Cr.No.516/2014 registered by the Thalaivasal Police Station, but the said factum of the remand of the detenu in the 4th adverse case in Cr.No.516/2014 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 Booklet furnished before us, the detenu was arrested by way of P.T.Warrant in the 4th adverse case in Cr.No.516/2014 registered by Thalaivasal Police Station. But the factum of remand of the detenu in the 4th adverse case not been reflected in paragraph 4 of the Grounds of Detention and only a reference has been made in respect of the ground case. When nothing has been stated about the remand of the detenu in the said 4th adverse case, it is not known whether the detenu has filed any bail application in the said adverse case or not. If that be so, there is no imminent possibility of the detenu coming out on bail in the said adverse cases. 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.

WEB COPY

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar

True Copy

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
[Home], Prohibition & Excise Department
Secretariat, Chennai-9.
- 2.The District Magistrate & District Collector
Salem District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Central Prison
Salem.
- 4.The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (L&O) Fort st.George, Chennai.
- 5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

+1 cc to Mr.R.Nalliappan, Counsel for Petitioner,SR.26159.

Vgi(co)
krd 18/6

H.C.P.No.58/2015