



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
DATED: 18.07.2018
CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE Mr. JUSTICE C.T.SELVAM
and
THE HONOURABLE Mr. JUSTICE A.M.BASHEER AHAMED

H.C.P.(MD)No.919 of 2018

Maheshwaran

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep.by its Principal Secretary to Government,
Prohibition & Excise Department (Home),
Chennai - 600 009.

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

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Madurai.

... Respondents

PRAYER: The petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records in detention order No.55/2018 dated 22.06.2018 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same as illegal and consequently, direct the respondents to produce the detenu namely, Senthil Kumar @ Thanchai Senthil, son of Regupathy, aged about 34 years, who detained in Central Prison, Madurai before this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Gandhi Kumar


For Respondents : Mr.V.Neelakandan, APP

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by C.T.SELVAM,J.)

Petitioner is the brother of detenu - Senthil Kumar @ Thanchai Senthil, son of Regupathy. Detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in 55/2018 dated 22.06.2018, holding him to be a "Goonda", as contemplated under Section of 2(f) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this Habeas Corpus Petition.

2.We have heard learned counsel for petitioner and learned Additional Public Prosecutor for respondents. We have also perused the records produced by the Detaining Authority.



3. Though several grounds have been raised in the Habeas Corpus Petition, the learned counsel for petitioner would mainly focus on the ground that there is gross violation of procedural safeguards, which would vitiate the detention. Learned counsel, by placing authorities, submitted that the arrest of the detenu in the ground case has not been intimated to the family members and that the fact of intimation of arrest of the detenu to his family members finds no support in the booklet produced.

4. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the Habeas Corpus petition. He would submit that though the arrest of detenu has not been intimated to the family members of the detenu, on the score alone, the impugned detention order cannot be quashed. According to the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, no prejudice has been caused to the detenu and thus, there is no violation of the fundamental rights guaranteed under Articles 21 and 22 of the Constitution of India.


5. It is a case, among other grounds, where the learned counsel for the petitioner would urge that the arrest of the detenu in the ground case has not been intimated to the family members or the relatives or to the known persons of the detenu as per the procedure laid down. Such act offends the decision of this Court in H.C.P.No.1897 of 2015 dated 21.09.2015 in the matter of Murugeswari V. The State of Tamil Nadu, Rep.by its Secretary to Government, Home, Prohibition & Excise Department and others. Therefore, the respondents have failed to satisfy this Court on due compliance of Section 50(2) of Cr.P.C., which vitiates the dictum of Hon'ble Apex Court in D.K.Basu Vs. State of West Bengal reported in AIR 1997 SC 610.

6. In view of the above decision rendered by the Division Bench of this Court and the decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in D.K.Basu's case, this Court is of the view that the detention order is unsustainable in law on the ground of intimation of arrest not made effectively, and therefore, the right conferred upon the detenu to impugne the arrest effected on him is affected. Hence, the detention order is liable to set aside.

7. In the result, the Detention Order, passed by the second respondent, in his proceedings in 55/2018 dated 22.06.2018 is quashed. The detenu, namely, Senthil Kumar @ Thanchai Senthil, son of Regupathy, is ordered to be set at liberty forthwith, if his detention is not required in connection with any other case. Accordingly, we allow the Habeas Corpus Petition.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CO)



To

- 1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St.George,
Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Dindigul District,
Dindigul.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Madurai.
- 4.The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law and Order),
Fort.St.George, Chennai - 9.
- 5.The Addl.Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

H.C.P. (MD) No.919 of 2018
18.07.2018

nbj

JM/SKN RSK/SAR 3/10.08.2018/3P/6C