



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 21.11.2019

Coram

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice M.M.SUNDRESH
and
The Hon'ble Mr. Justice RMT. TEEKAA RAMAN

H.C.P. No. 1942 of 2019

C.Babu ... Petitioner

-vs-

1.The Secretary to the Government
of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.

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

... Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the records in Memo No. 50/BCDFGISSSV/2019 on the file of the second respondent, quash the detention order dated 02.08.2019 and direct the respondents to produce the detenu Sathya, Son of Babu, detained at the Central Prison, Puzhal under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner	..	Mr.P.K.Ganesh
For Respondents	..	Mr.R.Prathap Kumar
		Addl. Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the father of the detenu, Sathya, Son of Babu, male, aged 23 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in No.50/BCDFGISSSV/2019 dated 02.08.2019, holding 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 the learned counsel for the petitioner raised several grounds, his main submission is that the arrest intimation in the ground case has not been enclosed in the booklet furnished to the detenu, which according to the detenu, deprived of his opportunity to make effective representation to the Government opposing the order of detention and hence, the order of detention is liable to be quashed.

4. There is no satisfactory explanation offered by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the detaining authority for the non-supply of the above said document.

5. Therefore, we are of the view that it is a fit case to set aside the impugned order of detention on the above grounds. Hence the impugned order of detention is liable to be set aside.

6. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in No.50/BCDFGISSSV/2019 dated 02.08.2019 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Sathya, Son of Babu, male, aged 23 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-VIII)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

mmi/ssm

To

1. The Secretary to the Government
of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Kancheepuram,
Kancheepuram District.
3. The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai.
4. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



5. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (law & Order),
Fort Saint George, Chennai 9

WEB COPY

H.C.P. No. 1942 of 2019

NRL (CO)
GN (07/01/2020)