



HCP(MD)No.658 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 17.08.2022

CORAM

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

H.C.P.(MD)No.658 of 2022

Kala

... Petitioner/Mother of the Detenu

Vs

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Secretariat, Chennai-9.

2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Thanjavur District.

3. The Inspector of Police,
Pattukottai Taluk Police Station,
Thanjavur.

4. The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Trichy District.

... Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records relating to the impugned detention order made in P.D.No.03/2022 dated 07.01.2022 passed by the 2nd



HCP(MD)No.658 of 2022

Respondent and quash the same and consequently direct the Respondents to set the detenu namely Thiru.Selvakumar, S/o.Murugesan, aged about 25 years at liberty, who is confined at Central Prison, Thiruchirapalli.

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Antony Arul Raj

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the detenu, viz.Selvakumar, son of Murugesan, aged 25 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in P.D.No.03/2022 dated 07.01.2022, 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



HCP(MD)No.658 of 2022

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.117 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.



HCP(MD)No.658 of 2022

6.As evidenced from the document in page No.117 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 Tapal 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.



HCP(MD)No.658 of 2022

8. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in P.D.No.03/2022 dated 07.01.2022, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Selvakumar, son of Murugesan, aged 25 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

(P.N.P.,J.) (R.H.,J.)
18.08.2022

Index : Yes/No

Internet : Yes

RR

To

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Secretariat, Chennai-9.

2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Thanjavur District.

3. The Inspector of Police,
Pattukottai Taluk Police Station,
Thanjavur.

4. The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Trichy District.

5. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.658 of 2022

P.N.PRAKASH,J.
and
R.HEMALATHA,J.

RR

H.C.P.(MD)No.658 of 2022

17.08.2022