

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 21.03.2016

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S.NAGAMUTHU
and
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.SATHYANARAYANAN

H.C.P.No.2526/2015

Muthulakshmi

.. Petitioner

Vs

1.The State of Tamil Nadu
rep. by the Secretary
Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St.George
Chennai 600 009.

2.The District Collector and
District Magistrate
Cuddalore District
Cuddalore.

.. Respondents

Prayer: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS to call for the entire records relating to the petitioner's husbands detention under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 vide Detention Order, dated 19.08.2015 on the file of the 2nd respondent herein made in Proceedings No.C3/D.O./38/2015, and quash the same as illegal and consequently to direct the respondents herein to produce the detenu Velu @ Tyrevandi Velu, S/o.Subramani, aged 30 years, before this Court and to set him at liberty, who is presently detained in Central Prison, Cuddalore.

For Petitioner

:Mr.R.Sethuvarayar

For Respondents

:Mr.A.N.Thambidurai,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by S.NAGAMUTHU, J.]

Challenge is made to the order of detention passed by the second respondent vide Proceedings No. C3/D.O./38/2015, dated 19.08.2015, whereby, the husband of the petitioner, by name, Velu @ Tyrevandi Velu, S/o.Subramani, aged 30 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, Sexual Offenders, Slum-grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 (Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982) branding him as a "Goonda" as contemplated under Section 2(f) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982.

2. As per the Grounds of Detention, dated 19.08.2015, passed by the second respondent, the detenu came to adverse notice in the following case:

i) Adverse Cases:

Sl No.	Name of the Police station and Crime No.	Section of law
1	Vridhachalam P.S. Cr.No.188/2015	U/s.294(b), 323, 448, 427 and 506 (i) IPC

(ii) Ground Case:

Sl No.	Name of the Police station and Crime No.	Section of law
1	Vridhachalam P.S. Cr.No.630/2015	U/s. 147, 148, 294(b), 324 and 302 IPC

3. Though, many grounds have been raised in the petition, Mr.R.Sethuvarayar, 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. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that in paragraph No.5 of the Grounds of Detention, it is stated that the detenu was remanded to judicial custody in connection with the ground case in Cr.No.630 of 2015. It is further stated in the very same paragraph that the detenu has not filed any bail petition so far. While so, the Detaining Authority has concluded that there is likelihood of the detenu coming out on bail by referring to a similar case. 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, Mr.A.N.Thambidurai, 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 on either side and we have also perused the records carefully.

6.As could be evidenced from paragraph No.5 of the Grounds of Detention the detenu was remanded to judicial custody in connection with the ground case in Cr.No.630 of 2015. It is further stated in the very same paragraph that the detenu has not filed any bail application so far. When the detenu has not at all moved any application for bail in connection with the ground case in Cr.No.630 of 2015, it is not known as to why the Detaining Authority has concluded that there is likelihood of the detenu coming out on bail by referring to a similar case. This only reflects that 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 ground.

9.Accordingly, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the impugned detention order dated 19.08.2015 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.

सत्यमेव जयते

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS VII)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1.The Secretary to Government,
Government of Tamil Nadu
Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St.George
Chennai 600 009.

2.The District Collector and
District Magistrate
Cuddalore District
Cuddalore.


3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

4.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Cuddalore.

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

vsn(CO)
srg(06/04/2016)

H.C.P.No.2526/2015



WEB COPY