

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 09.01.2017

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.JAICHANDREN
and
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE T.MATHIVANAN

H.C.P.No.1170 of 2016

Raghu

.. Petitioner

Vs

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

2.The State of Tamil Nadu,
rep by the Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
(Goondas Section),
Vepery, Chennai-600 007.

.. Respondents

Prayer: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS, calling for the entire records, relating to the impugned order of detention passed by the second respondent, in Memo No.255/BCDFGISSSV/2016, dated 7.3.2016 and to set aside the same and consequently, to direct the respondents to produce the detenu Raghu, son of late Elangovan, the petitioner herein, now confined in the Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Court and to set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Jotheeswaran

For Respondents : Mr.V.M.R.Rajentran, APP

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by **M.JAICHANDREN,J**]

This Habeas Corpus Petition has been filed by the detenu, namely, Raghu, aged about 25 years, son of Elangovan (late), to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records, in No.255/BCDFGISSSV/2016, dated 7.3.2016, passed by the second respondent, detaining the detenu, under Section 3(1) 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”, in the Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, and to quash the same and to direct the Respondents to produce the body of the detenu and to set him at liberty, forthwith.

2. We have heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, as well as the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State and we have also perused the records, carefully.

3. Though several grounds have been raised in this Habeas Corpus Petition, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, has assailed the impugned detention order mainly on the ground that the detaining

authority had stated, in paragraph No.4 of the order of detention, that the detenu, Raghu, is in remand in E4 Abiramapuram Police Station Crime Nos.195/2016, 255/2016 and 264/2016. He had moved bail applications, for Crime Nos.195/2016 and 255/2016, before the XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Saidapet, in CrI.M.P.Nos.754/2016 and 755/2016, respectively, which had been dismissed, on 2.3.2016. It had been further stated in the grounds of detention that the detenu had moved a bail application, for Crime No.264/2016, before the Principal Sessions Court, Chennai, in CrI.M.P.No.3287 of 2016, which is pending. It had been further stated in the grounds of detention that the relatives of the detenu, Raghu, are taking steps to take him on bail, in respect of Crime Nos.195/2016 and 255/2016, by filing bail applications before the appropriate Court. It had also been pointed out by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that no statements had been recorded from the relatives of the detenu with regard to the claim that they are taking steps to move bail applications, on behalf of the detenu, in the above said cases and no such statements had been furnished to the detenu.

4. The said submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner had not been refuted by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the respondents.

5. It is noted from the records available that no statements had been recorded from the relatives concerned to substantiate the claim that they are taking steps to move bail applications on behalf of the detenu, to take him

out on bail, in Crime Nos.195/2016 and 255/2016, on the file of E-4 Abiramapuram Police Station, which are the third and the fourth adverse cases, respectively. In such circumstances, we find that there is non application of mind on the part of the detaining authority, in passing the detention order. Therefore, we are inclined to set aside the detention order.

6. Accordingly, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the impugned detention order, dated 7.3.2016, 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.

[M.J.,J.] [T.M.,J.]
09.01.2017

vvk

To

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
The State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
(Goondas Section),
Vepery, Chennai-600 007.
- 3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

M.JAICHANDREN,J.
AND
T.MATHIVANAN, J.

vvk

H.C.P.No.1170 of 2016

09.01.2017
<http://www.judis.nic.in>