



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.561 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 20.10.2022

Coram

The Honourable Mr. Justice **P.N.PRAKASH**
and
The Honourable Mr. Justice **RMT.TEEKAA RAMAN**

H.C.P.No.561 of 2022

Sajidha Banu

.. Petitioner

Vs

- 1.State of Tamil Nadu represented by
The Secretary to Government [Home],
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Coimbatore District, Coimbatore.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Coimbatore District, Coimbatore.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Coimbatore.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Karumathampatti Police Station,
Coimbatore District.

.. Respondents



H.C.P.No.561 of 2022

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the entire records of the 2nd Respondent in his proceeding in Cr.M.P.No.07/G/2022/E1 dated 16.03.2022 to quash the same and consequently direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's son Babu @ Bytta, aged 24 years, S/o.Sirajudeen, before this Court, now confined in the Central Prison, Coimbatore, set the detenu at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Chinnaraj

For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Addl. Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(Made by *P.N.PRAKASH, J.*)

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu Babu @ Bytta, aged 24 years, S/o.Sirajudeen. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Cr.M.P.No.07/G/2022/E1 dated 16.03.2022, 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.



H.C.P.No.561 of 2022

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. Amidst several grounds raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner to attack the impugned order of detention, he has mainly focused his argument on the ground that the detaining authority failed to ask clarification from the sponsoring authority about non serving of arrest memo to the family members, relatives or friends of the detenu and there is no proof to show that the intimation of arrest was given, which clearly shows non-application of mind on the part of detaining authority.

4. A close reading of the booklet shows that though there is a mention about the adverse cases and ground case in the impugned order of detention, particularly Page No.159 of the booklet, there is no proof to show that the arrest of detenu has been intimated to the family members, relatives or friends as mandated by the Constitution. It is also to be remembered that in order to meet fairness, justness and reasonableness, after a person is taken into custody in pursuance



H.C.P.No.561 of 2022

of an order of detention, the members of his household, preferably the parent, the child or the spouse, must be informed in writing of the passing of the order of detention and of the fact that the detenu has been taken into custody, by duly intimating as to the place of detention, including the place where the detenu is transferred from time to time, which would ensure the right of the person arrested under preventive detention. If such intimation of arrest has not been made effectively, then, it would confer a right upon the arrestee to impugn the arrest effected on him.

5. In the case on hand, there is no proof to exhibit such intimation of arrest to the family members of the detenu. Thus, on account of the failure of the detaining authority in communicating the arrest of detenu to the family members, the detention order would be vitiated on the ground of deprivation of right guaranteed under Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India. Thus, for the reasons stated hereinabove, the impugned detention order cannot be sustained.

In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in Cr.M.P.No.07/G/2022/E1 dated 16.03.2022, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Babu



H.C.P.No.561 of 2022

@ Bytta, aged 24 years, S/o.Sirajudeen, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

(P.N.P., J.) (TKRJ)
20.10.2022

Index: Yes/No
nsd

To

- 1.The Secretary,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
(Goondas Section),
Vepery, Chennai – 600 007.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Puzhal Central Prison,
Chennai – 600 066.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
P-6, Kodungaiyur Police Station,
Chennai – 600 118.
- 5.The Joint Secretary to Government of Tamil Nadu,
Public, Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 9.
- 6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.561 of 2022

P.N.PRAKASH, J.
and
RMT.TEEKAA RAMAN, J.

nsd

H.C.P.No.561 of 2022

20.10.2022