

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 22.07.2015

CORAM

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

H.C.P.No.999 of 2015

Baskar @ Sakthiman

.. Petitioner

Vs.

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

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Chennai Police, Vepery, Chennai.

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ of habeas corpus calling for the records of the detention made in Memo No.72/BCDFGISSVS/2015 dated 03.02.2015 passed by the Commissioner of Police, Chennai Police, Vepery, Chennai, the second respondent herein and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu Baskar @ Sakthiman, son of Shanmugam, aged 24 years, now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal II, Chennai before this Court and set the detenu Baskar @ Sakthiman at liberty.

For Petitioner : Ms.Daniel Mary

For Respondents : Mr.M.Maharaja,
Addl. Public Prosecutor

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 No.72/2015 dated 03.02.2015, whereby the detenu/petitioner, by name, Baskar @ Sakthiman, son of

Shanmugam, aged 24 years, was ordered to be detained under the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law Offenders, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Sexual 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, Ms. Daniel Mary, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, confines her 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 Nos. 123 and 124 in the booklet furnished to the detenu are illegible and could not be read at all. These 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 this ground 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. 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 Nos. 123 and 124 are 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.

Sd/-
Asst.Registrar (CS III)

/true copy/

Sub Asst. Registrar

mmi

To

- 1.The Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 9.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Chennai Police, Vepery, Chennai.
- 3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.
- 4.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.
- 5.The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law & Order),
Fort St.George, Chennai - 9.

+2 ccs to M/s. Daniel Mary, Advocate, sr.37076.

H.C.P.No.999 of 2015

rsk(co)
kra(13/08)

WEB COPY