



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 07.11.2017

CORAM:

WEB COPY

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.SUBBIAH
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA**

H.C.P.(MD)No.816 of 2017

Varghese

: Petitioner

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Principal Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort. St.George, Chennai - 9.
2. The Deputy Inspector General of Police,
Madurai City and Commissioner of Police
Tirunelveli City, Tirunelveli
3. The Inspector of Police
Palayamkottai Police Station,
Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli City.
4. The Superintendent
Central Prison, Madurai.

: 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 records relating to the Detention Order passed by the 2nd respondent in No.27/BCDFGISSSV/2017 dated 18.05.2017 and to quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the person or body of the detenu, Anilkumar @ Kari, S/o.Varghese, aged about 27 years, before this Court and set him at liberty, now detained at Central Prison, Madurai.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Deenadayalan

For Respondents : Mr.C.Ramesh
Additional Public Prosecutor

**ORDER**

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

WEB COPY

The petitioner is the father of the detenu viz. Anilkumar @ Kari, son of Varghese, aged about 27 years. The detenu has been detained, as per the order of the second respondent, dated 18.05.2017, under Section 2(f) of the Tamil Nadu 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 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 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 17.05.2017 and passed the detention order on 18.05.2017. 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 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 Detention Order No.27/BCDFGISSSV/2017 dated 18.05.2017, is quashed. The detenu, namely Anilkumar @ Kari, son of Varghese, aged about 27 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(RTI)

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1. The Principal Secretary to Government
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort. St.George, Chennai - 9.
2. The Deputy Inspector General of Police,
Madurai City and Commissioner of Police
Tirunelveli City, Tirunelveli
3. The Inspector of Police
Palayamkottai Police Station,
Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli City.
4. The Superintendent
Central Prison, Madurai.
5. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law & order),
Res. to Gov. Secy. to Govt., Chennai-9.



6. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

+1 cc TO Mr.S.Deenadayalan , Advocate in SR No. 85658

WEB COPY

RR

AE/MR KKR/SAR1/20.11.2017/4P/8C

Order made in
H.C.P. (MD) No.816 of 2017
Dated: 07.11.2017