

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 21.04.2017

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.NAGAMUTHU

and

THE HONOURABLE DR.JUSTICE ANITA SUMANTH

H.C.P.No.2090 of 2016

P.Manoharan

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Commissioner of Police
Office of the Commissioner of Police
Egmore, Chennai.

2.The Secretary
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Chief Secretariat,
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.

3.The Superintendent
Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai.

.. 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 pertaining to the order of detention passed by the first respondent herein and made in No.968/BCDFGISSSV/2016 dated 26.08.2016 and to set aside the same and direct the third respondent to produce the detenu, the son of the petitioner, Thiru.Babu @ Olai Babu, aged 30 years, S/o.Manoharan now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this Court thereby setting him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.T.S.Srinivasan

For Respondents : Mr.V.M.R.Rajentren,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner, who is the father of the detenu Thiru.Babu @ Olai Babu, aged 30 years, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the first respondent, dated 26.08.2016, against his son 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, Mr.T.S.Srinivasan, 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 similar case bail application (in Tamil) in CrI.M.P.No.5852/2016 in P-6, Crime No.656/2016 furnished to the detenu and found in the booklet, is illegible and could not be read at all. This illegible copy, would deprive the detenu of making effective representation, to the authorities, against the order of detention. Thus, the detention order is vitiated. On this ground the impugned detention order 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 the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents and we have also perused the records carefully.

6.A perusal of the booklet supplied to the detenu, would show that the copy of document referred and relied upon and referred to by the Detaining Authority, in the similar case bail application (in Tamil) in CrI.M.P.No.5852/2016 in P-6, Crime No.656/2016 is 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 No.968/BCDFGISSSV/2016 dated 26.08.2016 passed by the first respondent is set aside. The detenu is directed to be released forthwith unless his presence is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-
ASST. REGISTRAR

/TRUE COPY/

SUB ASST. REGISTRAR

To

1.The Commissioner of Police
Office of the Commissioner of Police
Egmore, Chennai.

2.The Secretary
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Chief Secretariat,
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.


3.The Superintendent
Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai.

4.The Joint Secretary to government,
Public (law & order),fort st. George, chennai 9

5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.2090 of 2016

GJ (CO)
T.R (17/05/2017)



WEB COPY