



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 12.10.2017

CORAM:

WEB COPY

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

H.C.P. (MD) No. 818 of 2017

Kavitha : Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-9.

2. The District Collector / District Magistrate
Pudukottai District, Pudukottai.

3. The Superintendent of Police,
Pudukottai District, Pudukottai.

4. The Sub Collector,
Pudukottai District
Pudukottai.

5. The Inspector of Police,
Prohibition Enforcement Wing
Alangudi, Pudukottai District

6. The Superintendent
Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli 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 records relating to the 2nd respondent's impugned detention order in P.D.O.No.21 of 2017 dated 27.05.2017 and set aside the same as illegal and consequently directing the respondents to produce the detenu Sakthivel @ Sakthi, aged about 42 years, Son of Thangavel, now confined at Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Muthalraj

For Respondents : Mr.C.Ramesh

Additional Public Prosecutor



ORDER

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

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu viz., Sakthivel @ Sakthi, S/o.Thangavel, aged about 42 years. The detenu has been detained, as per the order of the second respondent, dated 27.05.2017, under Section 2(b) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982, branding him as "Boot-legger". Challenging the same, she 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 26.05.2017 and passed the detention order on 27.05.2017. 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 detention 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 P.D.O.No.21/2017, dated 27.05.2017, is quashed. The detenu, namely Sakthivel @ Sakthi, S/o.Thangavel, aged about 42 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,
Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-9.
 - 2.The District Collector / District Magistrate
Pudukottai District, Pudukottai.
 - 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Pudukottai District, Pudukottai.
 - 4.The Sub Collector,
Pudukottai District Pudukottai.
 - 5.The Inspector of Police,
Prohibition Enforcement Wing
Alangudi, Pudukottai District
 - 6.The Superintendent
Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli District
 - 7.The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law and Order) Fort Saint George, Chennai-600 009
 - 8.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.
- +One cc to M/s.Na.Palaniyandi, Advocate, SR.No.82580

RR

RL/10C/3P/MR/KKR/SAR3/31/10/2017

Order made in

H.C.P. (MD) No.818 of 2017