



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 04.12.2017

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.SUBBIAH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

H.C.P. (MD) No.1322 of 2017

Murugan

: Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Secretary to Government,
Department of Cooperation
Food and Consumer Protection Department
Secretariat
Chennai - 600 009.

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate
Tirunelveli District, Tirunelveli

3.The Additional Secretary to Government of India,
Department of Consumer Affairs,
Room No.270, Krishi Bhavan,
New Delhi.

4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli District

: Respondents

PRAYER: Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issue of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the entire records connected with the detention order passed in M.H.S.Confdl.No.85 of 2017 dated 21.08.2017 on the file of the 2nd respondent herein and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu or body of the detenu namely, Murugan, aged about 36 years, S/o.Esakki Thevar, now detained in Central Prison, Palayamkottai, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Pragalathan

For Respondents 1,2 and 4 : Mr.C.Ramesh

Additional Public Prosecutor

For Respondent 3 : Mr.C.Nandhagopal

**ORDER**

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

The petitioner is the detenu viz. Murugan, S/o. Esakki Thevar, aged about 36 years. The detenu has been detained, as per the order of the second respondent, dated 21.08.2017, under Section 3 (2)(a) read with 3(1) of the Prevention of Black Marketing and Maintenance of Supplies of Essential Commodities Act 1980 (Act 7 of 1980), branding him as "Black Marketeer". Challenging the same, he has come up with this Habeas Corpus Petition.

2. We have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional 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 on 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 21.08.2017 and passed the detention order on 21.08.2017. 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 order 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 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, passed by the second respondent, in his proceedings in M.H.S.Confdl.No.85 of 2017 dated 21.08.2017 is quashed. The detenu, namely Murugan S/o.Esakki Thevar, aged about 36 years, is ordered to be set at liberty forthwith, if he is not required for detention in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(Writs)

/True copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Department of Cooperation
Food and Consumer Protection Department
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate
Tirunelveli District, Tirunelveli
- 3.The Additional Secretary to Government of India,
Department of Consumer Affairs,
Room No.270, Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Palayamkottai, Tirunelveli District.
- 5.The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public(Law & Order),
Fort St.George, Chennai-9.
- 6.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

+1cc to Mr.C.NANDA GOPAL, Advocate, SR.90618

H.C.P. (MD) No.1322 of 2017

Dated: 04.12.2017

RR