



H.C.P.(MD) No.1349 of 2022

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 30.08.2022

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH
AND
THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE R.HEMALATHA**

H.C.P.(MD) No.1349 of 2022

Premkumar

... Petitioner

-VS-

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,

Rep. by the Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.

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

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli,
Tiruchirappalli District.

... Respondents



H.C.P.(MD) No.1349 of 2022

WEB

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the records connected with the detention order dated 25.10.2021 passed by the second respondent in Cr.M.P.No.16/2021 and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the detenu or body of the detenu namely Premkumar, son of Sekar, aged 31 years, who is presently undergoing detention in the Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Pragalathan

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner, Premkumar is the detenu, son of Sekar, aged 31 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Cr.M.P.No. 16/2021 dated 25.10.2021, 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.



H.C.P.(MD) No.1349 of 2022

WEB COPY

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.51 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.



H.C.P.(MD) No.1349 of 2022

WEB COPY

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 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.51 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 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.



H.C.P.(MD) No.1349 of 2022

WEB COPY

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 Cr.M.P.No.16/2021 dated 25.10.2021, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Premkumar, son of Sekar, aged 31 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.]
30.08.2022

Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
pkn



H.C.P.(MD) No.1349 of 2022

WEB COPY

To:

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Karur District, Karur.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli,
Tiruchirappalli District.
4. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD) No.1349 of 2022

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

pkn

H.C.P.(MD) No.1349 of 2022

30.08.2022