



HCP No.881 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 20.12.2022

Coram

**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH
and
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N.ANAND VENKATESH**

H.C.P.No.881 of 2022

Deepa
W/o.Rajasekar

... Petitioner

Vs.

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

... Respondents



HCP No.881 of 2022

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the records pertaining to the order of detention passed by the second respondent in C.M.P.No.8/Drug Offender/C2/2022 dated 07.05.2022 against the petitioner's husband Rajasekar S/o.Pitchaimuthu, aged 45 years, now confined at Central Prison, Salem and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Muruganantham
For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Made by **P.N.PRAKASH, J.**]

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu, Rajasekar S/o.Pitchaimuthu, aged 45 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in C.M.P.No.8/Drug Offender/C2/2022 dated 07.05.2022, holding him to be a "Drug Offender", as contemplated under Section 2(e) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this Habeas Corpus Petition.



HCP No.881 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. 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 detaining authority has stated, in page No.101 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 submitted that the arrest of the detenu has been intimated to the wife of the detenu.

5. 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.

6. As evidenced from the document in page No.101 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 wife of the detenu, 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 wife 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.



HCP No.881 of 2022

7. 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 C.M.P.No.8/Drug Offender/C2/2022 dated 07.05.2022, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Rajasekar S/o.Pitchaimuthu, aged 45 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[PNP, J.] [NAV, J.]
20.12.2022

Index: Yes/No
gm



WEB COPY



HCP No.881 of 2022

P.N.PRAKASH, J.
and
N.ANAND VENKATESH, J.
gm

To

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Salem District, Salem.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Salem District, Salem.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Salem.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Attaiyampatti Police Station,
Salem District.
- 6.The Joint Secretary to Government of Tamil Nadu,
Public, Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 9.
- 7.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.881 of 2022

20.12.2022