



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
DATED: 15.06.2022

Coram

The Honourable Mr. Justice **P.N.PRAKASH**
and
The Honourable Mrs. Justice **R.HEMALATHA**

H.C.P.[MD]No.594 of 2022

Parvathy .. Petitioner / Mother of the detenu
Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 9.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Madurai City, Madurai.

3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Madurai.

4.The Inspector of Police,
SS Colony Police Station,
Madurai District.

.. Respondents

PRAYER: 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 passed by the second respondent in Detention Order No.51/BCDFGISSSV/2021 dated 20.10.2021 and to quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu, Sathish, son of Balamurugan aged about 24 years before this Court and set him at liberty, now detained at Central Prison, Madurai.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Karunanithi

For Respondents : Mr.S.Ravi
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by *P.N.PRAKASH, J.*]

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu, Sathish, son of Balamurugan, aged 24 years. The detenu has been detained by the



second respondent by his order in No.51/BCDFGISSSV/2021 dated 20.10.2021, holding 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 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 sponsoring authority has stated in the Arrest Memo at page No.19 of the Booklet furnished to the detenu, that the arrest of the detenu has been intimated to the mother of the detenu. However, there is no material to substantiate the service of arrest intimation stated to have been made to the mother 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 mother of the detenu through SMS.

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.19 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 mother 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.

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.

WEB COPY

8. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in No.51/BCDFGISSSV/2021 dated 20.10.2021, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Sathish, son of Balamurugan, aged 24 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CO)

// True Copy //

/06/2022

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

MR

To:

- 1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai - 9.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Madurai City, Madurai.
- 3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Madurai.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
SS Colony Police Station, Madurai District.
- 5.The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law & Order),
Fort saint George, Chennai-600 009.
- 6.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

+1 CC to M/s.M. KARUNANITHI, Advocate (SR-26189[F] dated 16/06/2022)

H.C.P. [MD]No.594 of 2022
15.06.2022

RD(23.06.2022) 3P 8C

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>