

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED 29.07.2015

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE DR.JUSTICE S.TAMILVANAN
AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.T.SELVAM

H.C.P.No.816 of 2015

Govindaraj
S/o.Rajagopal
the

.. Petitioner/father of
detenue

Vs

1.State of Tamil Nadu
represented by its
Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Chennai Police,
Chennai - 600 008.

.. Respondents

Prayer:- This Habeas Corpus Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the entire records relating to petitioner's son detention under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 vide detention order, dated 28.02.2015 on the file of the second respondent herein made in proceedings No.210/2015 and quash the same as illegal and consequently, direct the respondents herein to produce the said petitioner's son namely Vinoth (a) Vinothkumar S/o.Govindaraj, aged 29 years, before this Court and set the petitioner's son at liberty from detention, now petitioner's son detained at Central Prison II, Puzhal, Chennai - 600 066.

For Petitioner
For Respondents

: Mr.C.C.Chellappan
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 No.210/2015, dated 28.02.2015, whereby the detenu, by name, Vinoth (a) Vinothkumar S/o.Govindaraj, aged about 29 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 "GOONDA".

2. Though many grounds have been raised in the petition, 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. Though the detaining authority has informed of the relatives of the detenu taking steps towards moving a bail application on his behalf, there is no material in support there regards. This according to the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner is bereft of particulars without cogent materials, which vitiates the impugned order of detention.

3. Per contra, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that the impugned detention order has been passed on cogent and sufficient materials and there is no illegality or infirmity in the impugned order of detention.

4. We have given our careful and anxious consideration to the rival submissions put forward by the learned counsel on either side and thoroughly scanned through the impugned detention order and the entire materials available on record.

5. It is seen that though the detaining authority has informed of the relatives of the detenu taking steps towards moving a bail application on his behalf, there is no material in support there regards. If that be so, the subjective satisfaction arrived at by the detaining authority that there is a possibility of his coming out on bail would be a mere ipse dixit and that would vitiate the order of detention. Therefore, the detention order suffers from infirmity and illegality warranting interference by this Court.

6. 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.

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

Accordingly, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and 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/-
Asst.Registrar (J)

/true copy/

Sub Asst. Registrar

gm

To

1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Chennai Police,
Chennai - 600 008.

3.The Superintendent of Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai.

4.The Joint Secretary to Government
Public Law & Order Fort St.George
Chennai-9

5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Chennai.

H.C.P.No.816 of 2015

sr(co)
aa13/08/2015