

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.290 of 2019

Sugumar

... Petitioner

Vs

- 1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep.by the Secretary, Home,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector,
Tiruvallur District. ...Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for a writ of habeas corpus, calling for the records relating to the detention order in B.C.D.F.G.I.S.S.S. No.37/2018, dated 05.12.2018 passed by the second respondent under the Tamilnadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondent to produce the petitioner's nephew Rajesh @ Rajesh Kumar S/o.Manoharan aged about 32 years the detenu, now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this Court and set the petitioner's nephew Rajesh @ Rajesh Kumar S/o. Manoharan aged about 32 years the detenu herein at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Raja

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

ORDER

(Order of the Court was delivered by M.M.SUNDRESH, J.)

The petitioner is the uncle of the detenu Rajesh @ Rajesh Kumar, S/o Manoharan, aged about 32 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in BCDFGISSSV No.37/2018 dated 05.12.2018, holding him to be a "GOONDA", as

contemplated under Section 2(f) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this Habeas Corpus Petition.

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

3.Though many grounds have been raised in the petition, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, confines his argument only in respect of non-application of mind on the part of the detaining authority in passing the order of detention. According to the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, the sponsoring authority has stated in the Arrest Memo, furnished to the detenu, that the arrest of the detenu has been intimated to the family member of the detenu. However, there is no material to substantiate the service of arrest intimation stated to have been made to the family member of the detenu. Therefore, it is stated that the detenu was deprived of making an effective representation in the absence of furnishing of full particulars by the detaining authority. Hence, it is stated that the Detaining Authority has passed the impugned detention order in total non-application of mind.

4.Per contra, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that the arrest of the detenu has been intimated to the family member of the detenu through SMS. However we find that there are no material particulars to substantiate the same. This Court has also taken the similar view in such cases that the detention order cannot be sustained.

5.As evidenced from the document found in the Booklet produced before us, a mere endorsement is made by the authorities to the effect that the arrest intimation has been informed to the family member of the detenu through SMS but no materials have been furnished to substantiate that the said intimation was sent through Thapal or Registered post or as per the procedure laid down. Therefore, non-furnishing of details given to the relatives of the detenu would amount to deprivation of the right of the detenu to make an effective representation and the same would vitiate the order of detention and the same cannot be sustained in the eye of law.

6.It is a trite law that personal liberty protected under Article 21 is so sacrosanct and so high in the scale of Constitutional values that it is the obligation of the detaining authority to show that the impugned detention meticulously accords with the procedure established by law. Preventive detention is preventive and not punitive. When ordinary law of

the land is sufficient to deal with, taking recourse to the preventive detention law is illegal. The impugned detention order is therefore liable to be quashed.

7. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in BCDFGISSSV No.37/2018 dated 05.12.2018, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Rajesh @ Rajesh Kumar, S/o Manoharan, aged about 32 years is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CCC)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

rst
To

1. The Secretary,
The State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector,
Tiruvallur District.
3. The Superintendent of Central Prison-II,
Puzhal, Chennai.
4. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.290 of 2019

WEB COPY

vsn II[co]
srg 10/07/2019