



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED:22.12.2017

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.SUBBIAH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

H.C.P.[MD].No.1292 of 2017

M.Maheswari : Petitioner

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu rep by

The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI)Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.

2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
O/o.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Pudukottai District,
Pudukottai.

3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli.

: Respondents

PRAYER: Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records in connection with the detention order passed in P.D.O.No.32/2017 dated 05.08.2017 on the file of the 2nd respondent herein and set aside the same as illegal and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of detenu, the petitioner's husband namely, Manikandan @ Vicki, S/o.Parthasarathi, aged 24 years, who is detained in Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli before this Court and set him at liberty. (Amended as per order of this Court in Crl.M.P(MD).No.11643/2017in H.C.P(MD).No.1292/17 dated 21.12.2017)

For Petitioner : Mr.K.G.Arunkumar

For Respondents : Mr.C.Ramesh

Additional Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

[Order of the Court was made by R.SUBBIAH, J.]

<https://hcservices.courts.gov.in/hcservices/> The Habeas Corpus Petition has been filed by the wife of the detenu - Manikandan @ Vicki, S/o.Parthasarathi, aged 24 years,. The detenu has been detained, as per the order of the



second respondent dated 05.08.2017 in P.D.O.No.32/2017, under Section 2(f) of the Tamilnadu Act 14 of 1982, branding him as "Goonda". Challenging the same, the petitioner has come up with this Habeas Corpus Petition.

2. We have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned State Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents. We have also perused the records carefully.

3. The main submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the affidavit filed by the sponsoring authority was attested by the detaining authority himself prior to the date of passing the detention order. In this regard, drawing the attention of this Court to the affidavit submitted by the Sponsoring Authority to the Detaining Authority, the learned counsel for the petitioner demonstrated that the Detaining Authority attested the affidavit filed by the sponsoring authority on 04.08.2017 and passed the detention order on 05.08.2017. The learned counsel for the petitioner further submitted that the attestation made by the Detaining Authority in the affidavit filed by the Sponsoring Authority would show the predetermination of mind on the part of the detaining authority in passing the order of detention. Hence, the detention order is liable to be set aside.

4. We have heard the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State and perused the records carefully.

5. The issue involved in this Habeas Corpus Petition has already been dealt with, elaborately, by this Court in H.C.P.(MD) No.857 of 2016, dated 24.01.2017, [Muthukumar @ Vellaian, Vs. The Secretary to Government, Home Prohibition and Excise Department, Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009], wherein this Court, after having considered various Judgments of this Court as well as the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in Paragraph No.11, has held as follows:-

"11. Of-course, it is true that the detaining authority is obligated to consider the materials placed before it independently and then to pass order on merits, without influencing the contents set out in the affidavit. However, the detaining authority cannot play a dual role, i.e., in one role he, being as a higher officer, affirms the necessity of the action to be taken and in another role, he, being the detaining authority, passes an order of detention. If the affidavit of the sponsoring authority is signed by some other higher official, then the question of possibility of predetermination would not arise. Since, in this case, the detaining authority played a dual role, the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the same led to predetermination of mind on the part of the detaining



authority, is acceptable.

6. Following the said decision, this Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the impugned detention order in P.D.O.No.32/2017 dated 05.08.2017, passed by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu by name, Manikandan @ Vicki, S/o.Parthasarathi, aged 24 years, is directed to be released forthwith, if his continued custody is not authorised in specific cases or by any other detention order.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(C.O.)

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

- 1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu
Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI)Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
O/o.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Pudukottai District,
Pudukottai.
- 3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli.(In duplicate for communication to detenu)
4. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law & Order) Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai.
- 5.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

ORDER MADE IN
H.C.P.[MD].No.1292 of 2017
22.12.2017

Ns

AM/SKN RSK/SAR 4/23.01.2018/3P/7C