

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 21.04.2015

CORAM

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

H.C.P.No.3184/2014

Kannagi

.. Petitioner

Vs.

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

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

.. 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 Cr.M.P. No.14/2014 dated 15.10.2014 on the file of the second respondent herein and to quash the same as illegal and consequently to direct the respondents to produce the detenu Velmurugan, son of Murugesan, aged about 31 years, who is now confined in Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli, before this Court and to set him at liberty.

For petitioner : Mr.K.Gandhi Kumar
For respondents: Mr.M.Maharaja
Additional Public Prosecutor

सत्यमेव जयते

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.M.P. No.14/2014 dated 15.10.2014, whereby the detenu/husband of the petitioner by name, Velmurugan, son of Murugesan, aged about 31 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 "GOONDA".

2.As per the grounds of detention dated 15.10.2014, passed by the second respondent, the detenu came to adverse notice in the following cases:

i)Adverse Cases:

Sl Nos	Name of the Police station and Crime No.	Section of law
1	Irumbulikkurichi PS Cr.No.206/2012	379 IPC
2	Irumbulikkurichi PS Cr.No.30/2013	457 and 380 IPC
3	Irumbulikkurichi PS Cr.No.91/2014	392 IPC
4	Irumbulikkurichi PS Cr.No.138/2014	379 IPC
5	Kuvagam PS Cr.No.127/2014	457 and 380 IPC

(ii) Ground Case:

Sl No.	Name of the Police station and Crime No.	Section of law
1	Irumbulikkurichi PS Cr.No.141/2014	392 r/w. 397 IPC

3. Though many grounds have been raised in the petition, Mr.K.Gandhi Kumar, 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 all the adverse cases in Cr.Nos.206/2012, 30/2013, 91/2014, 138/2014 and 127/2014 registered by the Irumbulikkurichi Police Station, but the said factum of the remand of the detenu in the 5th adverse case in Cr.No.127/2014 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.

7.As could be evidenced from the Booklet furnished before us, the detenu was arrested by way of P.T.Warrant in the adverse cases in Cr.Nos.206/2012, 30/2013, 91/2014, 138/2014 and 127/2014 registered by the Irumbulikkurichi Police Station. But the factum of remand of the detenu in the 5th adverse case in Crime No.127/2014 has not been reflected in paragraph 4 of the Grounds of Detention and only a reference has been made in respect of the ground case and adverse case Nos.1 to 4 in Cr.Nos.206/2012, 30/2013, 91/2014, 138/2014. When nothing has been stated about the remand of the detenu in the said 5th adverse case, it is not known whether the detenu has filed any bail application in the said 5th adverse case 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.

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/-

Assistant Registrar

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

vga

To

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

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

3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

4.The Superintendent of Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli.

5. The Joint Secretary to Government Public
(Law & order) Fort St. George, Chennai-9.

H.C.P.No.3184/2014

RSK(CO)
Eu 20.05.2015



WEB COPY