

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.884/2015

Chitra

..

Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department
Secretariat, Chennai-9.

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

..

Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the 2nd respondent dated 03.12.2014 in Cr.MP.No.11/Goonda/2014 against the petitioner's husband Saravanan, Male, aged 40 years, son of Solaimalai, who is confined at Central Prison, Coimbatore and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu before this Court and set him at liberty.

For petitioner : Mr.S.Senthil Vel
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 Cr.MP.No.11/Goonda/2014 dated 03.12.2014, whereby the husband of the petitioner by name Saravanan, aged 40 years, son of Solaimalai, 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 "Goonda".

2.Though many grounds have been raised in the petition, Mr.S.Senthil Vel, 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 3rd and 5th adverse cases in Cr.Nos.84/2013 and 203/2014 registered by Uthiyur Police Station and Uthukuli Police Station ; but the said factum of the remand of the detenu in the 3rd and 5th adverse cases in Cr.Nos.84/2013 and 203/2014 has not been reflected in the grounds of detention, more particularly in paragraph 5 of the Detention order. Further, the Detaining Authority has made a mention only about the ground case in Cr.No.453/2014 wherein the detenu has not moved any bail application as on the date of passing of the detention order. It is further submitted that no materials have been furnished by the Detaining Authority that the relatives of the detenu are taking steps to bring the detenu out on bail. 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.

6.As could be evidenced from the Booklet furnished before us, the detenu was arrested by way of P.T.Warrant in the 3rd and 5th adverse cases in Cr.Nos.84/2013 and 203/2014 registered by Uthiyur Police Station and Uthukuli Police Station. But the factum of remand of the detenu in the adverse case Nos.3 and 5, viz., in Cr.Nos.84/2013 and 203/2014, 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 no bail application was filed by the detenu as on the date of the passing of the detention order. When nothing has been stated about the remand of the detenu in the said adverse case Nos.3 and 5, 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 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.

-s/d-
Assistant Registrar

True Copy

Sub-Assistant Registrar

AP

To

1. The Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department
Secretariat, Chennai-9.
2. The District Magistrate & District Collector
Tiruppur District, Tiruppur.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.
4. The Superintendent of Central Prison
Coimbatore.
5. The Joint Secretary to Government, Public (L&O)
Fort St. George, Chennai.

WEB COPY

H.C.P.No.884/2015

svi(co)
aa27/7/2015