



WEB COPY



HCP No.1625 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 01.11.2022

Coram

**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH
and
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RMT. TEEKAA RAMAN**

H.C.P.No.1625 of 2022

Naveen Kumaran
S/o.Balasubramanian

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St.George,
Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police/Detaining Authority,
Tiruppur City, Tiruppur District.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison – Coimbatore,
Coimbatore District.

4.State represented by its
The Inspector of Police,
Cyber Crime Police Station,
Tiruppur City, Tiruppur District.

... Respondents



HCP No.1625 of 2022

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the entire records relating to the petitioner's brother detention under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 vide detention order dated 24.02.2022 on the file of the second respondent herein made in proceedings Memo C.No.09/C.L.O/IS/Tiruppur City/2022, quash the same as illegal and consequently, direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's brother namely Vijayakumar s/o.Palanisamy, aged 26 years, before this Court and set the petitioner's brother at liberty from detention, now the petitioner's brother detained at Central Prison, Coimbatore.

For Petitioner : Mr.W.Camyles Gandhi

For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Made by ***RMT. TEEKAA RAMAN, J.***]

The petitioner is the cousin of the detenu, Vijayakumar s/o.Palanisamy, aged 26 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in C.No.09/C.L.O/IS/Tiruppur City/2022 dated 24.02.2022, holding him to be a "Cyber Law Offender", as contemplated under Section 2(bb) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this Habeas Corpus Petition.



HCP No.1625 of 2022

2. We have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Public Prosecutor 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 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 for the petitioner, the sponsoring authority has stated in the Arrest Memo furnished to the detenu, that the arrest of the detenu has been intimated to the brother of the detenu. However, there is no material to substantiate the service of arrest intimation stated to have been made to the brother 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 brother 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 Booklet furnished to us, a mere endorsement is made by the authorities to the effect that the arrest intimation has been informed to the brother 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 brother 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.1625 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.

8. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in C.No.09/C.L.O/IS/Tiruppur City/2022 dated 24.02.2022, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Vijayakumar s/o.Palanisamy, aged 26 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[PNP, J.] [TKR, J.]
01.11.2022

Index: Yes/No
gm



HCP No.1625 of 2022

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

gm

To

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St.George,
Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police/Detaining Authority,
Tiruppur City, Tiruppur District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison – Coimbatore,
Coimbatore District.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
Cyber Crime Police Station,
Tiruppur City, Tiruppur District.
- 5.The Joint Secretary to Government of Tamil Nadu,
Public, Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 9.
- 6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.1625 of 2022

01.11.2022