



HCP No.989 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 07.12.2022

Coram

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

H.C.P.No.989 of 2022

Selva Kumari
W/o.Dharmalingam

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.State of Tamil Nadu
represented by
The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Krishnagiri, Krishnagiri District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Krishnagiri, Krishnagiri District.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Salem,
Salem District.



HCP No.989 of 2022

5. The Inspector of Police,
Mathigiri Police Station,
Krishnagiri District.

... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the records relating to the detention order in S.C.No.17/2022 dated 10.05.2022 passed by the second respondent under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondent to produce the petitioner's husband Dharmalingam S/o.Ponpandi, aged about 37 years, the detenu, now confined at Central Prison, Salem, before this Court and set the petitioner's husband at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.B.Ramesh Babu
For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu, Dharmalingam S/o.Ponpandi, aged about 37 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in S.C.No.17/2022 dated 10.05.2022, 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.



HCP No.989 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.59 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.



HCP No.989 of 2022

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.

5. 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.

6. As evidenced from the document in page No.59 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.989 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 S.C.No.17/2022 dated 10.05.2022, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Dharmalingam S/o.Ponpandi, aged about 37 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[PNP, J.] [NAV, J.]
07.12.2022

Index: Yes/No
gm



WEB COPY



HCP No.989 of 2022

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

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Krishnagiri, Krishnagiri District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Krishnagiri, Krishnagiri District.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Salem,
Salem District.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Mathigiri Police Station,
Krishnagiri 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.989 of 2022

07.12.2022