

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 03.06.2021

Coram

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice M.M.SUNDRESH
and

The Hon'ble Ms. Justice R.N.MANJULA

H.C.P. No.2366 of 2020

Poomayil

... Petitioner/Mother of Detenu

-vs-

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition Excise Department,
Fort St., George, Chennai -600 009.
- 2.The District Magistrate and
District Collector,
Tiruvallur District.
- 3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison-II, Puzhal, Chennai.
- 4.The Superintendent of Police,
Tiruvallur District.
- 5.The Inspector of Police, (Law & Order),
E-5, Sholavaram Police Station,
Tiruvallur District.

... 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 2nd respondent dated 12.10.2020 in BCDFGISSSV No.42/2020 against the petitioner son Mr.Sethu @ Sethupathi, Male aged about 26 years, son of Chellam, who is confined at Central Prison Puzhal, Chennai and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu before the Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Illiyas

For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj

Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu - Sethu @ Sethupathi, son of Chellam, male, aged 26 years. The detenu has

been detained by the second respondent by his order in BCDFGISSSV No.42/2020 dated 12.10.2020, 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 (Criminal Side) 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.13 of the Booklet 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 Government Advocate (Crl. Side) 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 in page No.13 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 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.42/2020 dated 12.10.2020, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Sethu @ Sethupathi, son of Chellam, male, aged 26 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

mml/jrs
To

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition Excise Department,
Fort St., George, Chennai -600 009.
- 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Tiruvallur District.
- 3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison-II, Puzhal, Chennai.
- 4.The Superintendent of Police,
Tiruvallur District.
- 5.The Inspector of Police, (Law & Order),
E-5, Sholavaram Police Station,
Tiruvallur District.
- 6.The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law and order) Fort.St.George, Chennai 9.
- 7.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.2366 of 2020

RP (CO)
A.SK(17.06.2021)