



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 29.04.2015

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE DR.JUSTICE S.TAMILVANAN
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE B.RAJENDRAN

H.C.P.No.69/2015

E.Balaji

..

Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu, Home,
Prohibition and Excise Department
Secretariat, Chennai..

2.The District Collector & District Magistrate
Vellore District, Vellore. .. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the records in Memo No.C3.D.O.No,110/2014 passed by the 2nd respondent on 27.12.2014, set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce Deivasigamani, son of Inbam, aged 40 years, who is now detained in Central Prison, Vellore, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For petitioner : Mr.S.Swamidoss Manokaran

For respondents : Mr.M.Maharaja, APP

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 C3.D.O.No.110/2014 dated 27.12.2014, whereby the detenu/the brother of the petitioner by name Deivasigamani, son of Inbam, aged 40 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".



WEB COPY

2.As per the grounds of detention dated 27.12.2014, passed by the second respondent, the detenu came to adverse notice in the following cases:

i) Adverse Cases:

S1 No.	Name of the Police station and Crime No.	Section of law
1	Vellore PEW Cr.No.370/2014	4[1][aaa], 4[1-A][ii] TNP Act [Act 10/1937] r/w 7 of Tamil Nadu Rectified Spirit Rules, 2000
2	Vellore PEW Cr.No.395/2014	4[1][a] TNP Act, 1937 [Act 10/1937]

(ii) Ground Case:

S1 No.	Name of the Police station and Crime No.	Section of law
1	Ranipet PEW Cr.No.416/2014	4[1][a], 4[1][aaa], 4[1-A][ii] TNP Act, 1937 and 468, 471 IPC & 7 of RS Rules, 2000 r/w 420 IPC

3. Though many grounds have been raised in the petition, Mr.S.Swamidoss Manokaran, 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.

4.Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the detenu has been formally arrested and remanded to judicial custody in the 1st adverse case in Cr.No.370/2014 registered by the Vellore Prohibition Enforcement Wing, but the said factum of the remand of the detenu in the said adverse case 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.

5.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.

6.We have heard the learned counsel for both sides with regard to the facts and citation.



WEB COPY

7.As could be evidenced from the Grounds of Detention furnished before us, the detenu was arrested by way of P.T.Warrant in the 1st adverse case in Cr.No.370/2014 registered by Vellore Prohibition Enforcement Wing. But the said factum of remand of the detenu in the said adverse case has not been reflected in paragraph 5 of the Grounds of Detention and only a reference has been made in respect of the ground case, wherein he was granted conditional bail. When nothing has been stated about the remand of the detenu in the said adverse case, it is not known whether the detenu has filed any bail application in the said adverse cases 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.

8.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.

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

10.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/-
Asst.Registrar (CS IV)

/true copy/

Sub Asst. Registrar

AP



To

WEB COPY

1. The Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu, Home,
Prohibition and Excise Department
Secretariat, Chennai..
2. The District Collector & District Magistrate
Vellore District, Vellore.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.
4. The Superintendent of Central Prison
Vellore.
5. The Joint Secretary to Government
Public (Law and order)
Fort St. George, Chennai-9

H.C.P.No.69/2015

PA (CO)
kk 21/5