

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 15.06.2016

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S.NAGAMUTHU
and
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE V.BHARATHIDASAN

H.C.P.No.437 of 2016

Bhuvaneswari

..Petitioner/(Mother in law)

vs.

1. Government of Tamilnadu
Rep. by its Principal Secretary,
Home, Prohibition and
Excise (XVI) Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai - 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Salem City.

..Respondents

Prayer : Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ of habeas corpus calling for the records in C.M.P.No.10/Goonda/Salem City/2016 dated 15.02.2016 on the file of the 2nd respondent herein and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the body of the petitioner's son-in-law Muthu @ Javaimuthu @ Muthukumar, aged 32 years, son of Rangaraj now confined in central Prison, Salem before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Subhadra Devi

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

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by S.NAGAMUTHU, J.)

The petitioner, who is the mother-in-law of the detenu Muthu @ Javaimuthu @ Muthukumar, son of Rangaraj, aged 32 years, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent, dated 15.02.2016, against her husband branding him as a "Goonda" under 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].

2.Though, many grounds have been raised in the petition, Ms.R.Subhadra Devi, 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, certain pages 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 these grounds 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, certain pages 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 in C.M.P.No.10/Goonda/Salem City/2016 dated 15.02.2016 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.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS VI)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

kua

To

- 1.The Principal Secretary,
Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Salem City.
3. The Superintendent, Central Prison,
Salem.
4. The Joint Secretary to Government Public
(Law & order), Fort St. George, Chennai. 600 009.
5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.437 of 2016

CTK(CO)
Eu 04.7.16

WEB COPY