



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED 12.11.2021

WEB COPY

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH
AND
THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE R.HEMALATHA

H.C.P.NO.955 OF 2021

Gayathri

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Government of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by its Principal Secretary
Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department
Fort St. George, Chennai-9

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

3.The Inspector of Police
Thiruvallur, Thiruvallur District

4.The Superintendent of Police
Thiruvallur, Thiruvallur District

5.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai-66

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS calling for the records pertaining in BCDFGISSV No.58/2021 dated 28.04.2021 on the file of the 2nd respondent herein and direct the respondents herein to produce the body of the petitioner's husband Thamilarasan, S/o.Palani, aged about 32 years, now confined in Puzhal jail, Chennai, before this Court and set him at liberty.



WEB COPY

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Vijayasankar

For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Additional Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

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

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu viz., Thamilarasan, S/o.Palani, aged about 32 years. The detenu has been detained by the 2nd respondent by his order dated 28.04.2021 in BCDFGISSSV No.58/2021, 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 at page No.33 of the Booklet furnished to the detenu, that the arrest of the detenu has been intimated to the wife of the detenu. However, there is no material to substantiate the service of arrest intimation stated to have been made to the wife 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 wife 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.

WEB COPY

5. As evidenced from the document in page No.33 of the Booklet furnished to us, a mere endorsement is made by the authorities to the effect that the arrest intimation has been informed to the mother of the detenu through SMS, but, no materials have been furnished to substantiate that the said intimation was sent through Tapal 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.

In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in BCDFGISSSV No.58/2021, dated 28.04.2021, passed by the 2nd respondent is set aside. The detenu viz., Thamilarasan, S/o.Palani, aged about 32 years, is directed to be released forthwith, unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-
Deputy Registrar(CS)

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar

gya



To

1.The Principal Secretary
Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department
Fort St. George, Chennai-9

2.The Joint Secretary to Government
Public, Law and Order Department
Secretariat, Chennai-9

3.The District Magistrate and District Collector
Thiruvallur District, Thiruvallur

4.The Inspector of Police
Thiruvallur, Thiruvallur District

5.The Superintendent of Police
Thiruvallur, Thiruvallur District

6.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai-66

7.The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras

H.C.P.No.955 of 2021

GP(CO)
RLP(16/11/2021)