

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 11.06.2019

Coram

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice **M.M.SUNDRESH**
and
The Hon'ble Mr. Justice **M. NIRMAL KUMAR**

H.C.P. No. 43 of 2019

Sathishkumar @ Araichi

... Petitioner

-VS-

1.State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep.By,The Secretary,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai City,
Commissioner Office,
Vepery, Chennai - 600 007

सत्यमेव जयते

... Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records in Memo No.1135/BCDFGISSSV/2018 dated 14.12.2018 on the file of the second respondent and quash the detention order as illegal and

direct the respondents to produce the detenu Sathishkumar @ Araichi, S/o Palraj, aged about 22 years, now confined at Central Prison, Puzhal - II, Chennai.

For petitioner : Mr.A. Elumalai

For Respondents : Mr.R. Prathap Kumar
Addl. Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by M.M.SUNDRESH, J.]

The petitioner, who is the detenu, has come up with this habeas corpus petition, challenging the detention order passed against him by the second respondent, vide Memo No.1135/BCDFGISSSV/2018 dated 14.12.2018, branding him as a "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 [Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].

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

3. Though, several grounds were raised in the petition, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would mainly focus on the ground only in respect of non-application of mind on the part of the detaining authority in passing the order of detention.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that Page Nos.136 and 170 of the booklet, furnished to the detenu, are illegible and could not be read at all. This illegible copy would deprive the detenu of making effective representation to the authorities against the order of detention. Thus, the detention order is vitiated on this ground and the same is liable to be quashed.

5. We have gone through the same. A perusal of the booklet supplied to the detenu would show that Page Nos.136 and 170 of the booklet furnished to the detenu are illegible and could not be read at all. This has resulted in the detenu being deprived of making an effective representation. Therefore, the detention order is vitiated and liable to be quashed on this ground alone.

6. In the light of the above facts and law, we have no hesitation in quashing the order of detention on the above mentioned ground. Accordingly, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the impugned detention order in Memo No1135/BCDFGISSSV/2018 dated 14.12.2018 passed by the 2nd respondent is set aside. The detenu is directed to be released forthwith unless his presence is required in connection with any other case.

(M.M.S.,J.) (M.N.K.,J.)
11.06.2019

Index : Yes / No
sr

सत्यमेव जयते
WEB COPY

To:

- 1.The Secretary,
The State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai City,
Commissioner Office,
Vepery, Chennai – 600 007.
- 3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal-II,
Chennai.
- 4.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

**M.M.SUNDRESH, J.
and
M. NIRMAL KUMAR, J.**

SR



H.C.P. No. 43 of 2019

WEB COPY

11.06.2019