

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 24.05.2016

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G. CHOCKALINGAM
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.V. MURALIDARAN

H.C.P.No.261 of 2016

Gowri ... Petitioner/Mother of Detenu

Vs.

1. The Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Secretariat
Chennai 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Chennai Police, Chennai. ... 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 23.12.2015 in BCDFGISSSV No. 1275/2015 against the son of the Petitioner, Detenu Vinoth M/A 30, S/o. Radhakrishnan, who is confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai and to set aside the same and consequently direct the respondents to produce the detenu before the Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Ms.P. Bagiyalakshmi
For Respondents: Mr.M.Maharaja,
Addl. Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

[Order of the Court was made by G. CHOCKALINGAM, J.]

Challenge is made to the order of detention passed by the second respondent in Memo No. 1275/BCDFGISSSV/2015 dated 23.12.2015, whereby the detenu, namely Vinoth, S/o. Radhakrishnan, aged about 30 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. Though many grounds have been raised in the petition, Ms.P. Bagiyalakshmi, 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 the detenu has been remanded to judicial custody in the 4th & 5th adverse cases in Crime Nos. 761 & 783 of 2015 on the file of K-5 Pervallore Police Station and though a mention has been made by the Detaining Authority in respect of the ground case and 4th and 5th adverse cases in paragraph 4 of the Grounds of Detention, the factum of the remand of the detenu in the 1st, 2nd and 3rd adverse cases in Cr.Nos. 669/2015 on the file of K-1 Sembium Police Station, 567/2015 on the file of Thiru.Vi.Ka. Nagar Police Station and 902/2015 on the file of K-1 Sembium Police Station has not been reflected. 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 and citation.

6. As could be evidenced from the Grounds of Detention, the detenu was arrested in the 4th and 5th adverse cases in Cr.Nos. 761 & 783 of 2015. But the factum of remand of the detenu in the 1st, 2nd and 3rd adverse cases in Cr.Nos. 669/2015, 567/2015 & 902/2015 has not been reflected in paragraph 4 of the Grounds of Detention. When nothing has been stated about the remand of the detenu in the said adverse cases, 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 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(J)

True Copy

Sub-Assistant Registrar

kua

To

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

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

3.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

4.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

5.The Joint Secretary to Government
Public Law and Order Fort St.George
Chennai-9

+1 cc to Mr.R.Sonia glory, Advocate sr.28706/16

H.C.P.No.261/2016

ca(co)
aa02/06/2016