

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.496 of 2016

Kumar

..Petitioner

Vs.

1. State of Tamilnadu
Rep. By its Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.

2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai Police,
Veperiy, Chennai - 600 007.

..Respondents

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 petitioner's son detention under Tamilnadu Act 14 of 1982 vide detention order dated 06.01.2016 on the file of the 2nd respondent herein made in proceedings BCDFGISSSV No.1 of 2016, quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce petitioner's son namely, Arun Kumar son of Kumar, aged 24 years before this Court and set him at liberty from detention, now detained at Central Prison-II, Puzhal, Chennai.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.C.Chellappan

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 vide Proceedings in Memo No.01/BCDFGISSSV/2016 dated 06.01.2016, whereby the detenu, namely Arun Kumar S/o. Kumar, aged about 24 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, Mr.C.C.Chellappan, 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.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the detenu has been remanded to judicial custody in adverse cases in Cr.No.1018/2015 on the file of C1 Flower Bazaar Police Station, Cr.No.1024/2015 on the file of C1 Flower Bazaar Police Station, Cr.No.847 of 2015 on the file of B2 Esplanade Police Station and Crime No.3025 of 2015 on the file of S7 Madipakkam Police Station and though a mention has been made by the Detaining Authority in respect of the ground case in paragraph No.4 of the Grounds of Detention, the factum of the remand of the detenu in all the four adverse cases, namely, in Cr.Nos. 1018, 1024, 847 and 3025 of 2015 have 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 adverse cases in Cr.Nos.1018 of 2015, 1024/2015, 847/2015 and 3025/2015. But the factum of remand of the detenu in the all the four adverse cases in Cr.Nos.1018/2015, 1024 of 2015, 847 of 2015 and 3025 of 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.

ssd

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1. State of Tamilnadu
Rep. By its Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai Police,
Vepery, Chennai - 600 007.
3. The Superintendent, Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai.
4. The Joint Secretary to Govt.
Public (Law & Order),
Fort St. George, Chennai 600 009.
5. The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras.

KR/10/6/16

H.C.P.No.496 of 2016