

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 13.07.2015

CORAM

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

H.C.P.No.758/2015

Vidhya

..

Petitioner

Vs.

1.the Secretary to Government
State of Tamilnadu
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department
Fort St George, Chennai 600 009.

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

3.The Addl. Secretary,
Government of India, Ministry of Consumer
Affairs, Food and Public Distribution
[Dept. of Consumer Affairs]
Room No.270, Krishi Bhawan,
New Delhi 110001.

...

Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ of habeas corpus calling for the entire records relating to the petitioner's husband detention u/s.3 [1] r/w 3[2][b] of the Prevention of Black Marketing and Maintenance of Supplies of Essential Commodities Act, 1980 [Central Act 7 of 1980] vide detention order dated 05.03.2015 on the file of the 2nd respondent herein made in proceedings Cr.MP.No.01/2015 [CS] quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's husband namely K.Gunasekaran, son of Kittan, aged 45 years, before this Court and set the petitioner's husband at liberty from detention now the petitioner's husband detained at Central Prison, Coimbatore.

For Petitioner	:	Mr.K.R.Ramesh
For RR 1 & 2	:	Mr.M.Maharaja,APP
For R3	:	M/s.N.K.Nithilavani, CGSC

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 Cr.MP.No.01/2015 [CS] dated 05.03.2015, whereby the detenu/the husband of the petitioner, by name, K.Gunasekaran, son of Kittan, aged 45 years, was ordered to be detained under the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Black Marketing and Maintenance of Supplies of Essential Commodities Act, 1980 (Central Act 7 of 1980) branding him as a "BLACK MARKETER".

2.Though many grounds have been raised in the petition, Mr.K.R.Ramesh, 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 page No.98 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 Advocate General 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 No.98 etc., is 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.

-s/d-
Assistant Registrar(CSIII)
dt:29/07/2015

True Copy

Sub-Assistant Registrar

ap
To

1. the Secretary to Government
State of Tamilnadu
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department
Fort St George, Chennai 600 009.
2. The District Magistrate and District Collector
Tiruppur District, Tiruppur.
3. The Addl. Secretary,
Government of India, Ministry of Consumer
Affairs, Food and Public Distribution
[Dept. of Consumer Affairs]
Room No.270, Krishi Bhawan,
New Delhi 110001.
4. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.
5. The Superintendent of Central Prison
Coimbatore.
6. The Joint Secretary to Government
Public (law & order) department,
Fort St. George, Chennai-9

+1 cc to Mrs.N.K.Nithilavani Advocate CGSC sr.35279

H.C.P.No.758/2015

aa31/07/2015