



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 13.07.2021

Coram

The Honourable Mr. Justice P.N.PRAKASH
and
The Honourable Mr. Justice R.PONGIAPPAN

H.C.P.No.1 of 2021

Nanthini

.. Petitioner/Wife of the detenue

Vs.

1. The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai - 66.
4. The Inspector of Police (L & O),
T-2, Ambattur Estate Police Station,
Chennai.

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the second respondent dated 17.12.2020 in Memo No.517/BCDFGISSSV/2020 against the petitioner's husband Sathishkumar, aged about 30



years, son of Gangadurai, who is confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Senthilvel
For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj,
: Govt.Advocate
(Crl.Side)

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by P.N.PRAKASH, J.]

The petitioner is the wife of Sathishkumar, aged about 30 years, son of Gangadurai, who is the detenu. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Memo No.517/BCDFGISSSV/2020 dated 17.12.2020, 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 Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondents and we have also perused the




records carefully.

WEB COPY

3. Though several grounds have been raised, learned counsel for the petitioner mainly focused his arguments on the ground that the remand extension order pertaining to the ground case placed before the detaining authority has not been furnished to the detenu, which caused great prejudice to the detenu and he has been prevented from making an effective representation for consideration of the authorities concerned. Therefore, the impugned order of detention is vitiated in law.

4. A perusal of the booklet would go to show that the remand extension order pertaining to the ground case placed before the detaining authority has not been enclosed in the booklet furnished to the detenu. Therefore, non-furnishing of the above materials would obviously deprive of his opportunity to make effective representation and hence, we are of the opinion that the detention order is liable to be quashed on this ground.

In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in Memo No.517/BCDFGISSSV/2020 dated 17.12.2020, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Sathishkumar, aged about 30 years, son of



Gangadurai, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

WEB COPY

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS VII)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

nsd

To

1. The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai - 66.
4. The Inspector of Police (L & O),
T-2, Ambattur Estate Police Station,
Chennai.
5. The Joint Secretary to Government of Tamil Nadu,
Public, Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 9.
6. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.1 of 2021

SR-II(CO)
SU(13/07/2021)