



H.C.P.No.834 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED 03.01.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH
AND
THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE N.ANAND VENKATESH

H.C.P.No.834 of 2022

Vasanthakumar

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu represented by
its Secretary of Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai-9.

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

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Krishnagiri District.

4.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Salem 636 007.

5.The Inspector of Police,
Denkanikottai Police Station,
Krishnagiri District. (Crime No.530/2021)

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to
issue a WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS to call for the entire records leading to



H.C.P.No.834 of 2022

the detention of petitioner's brother the detenu Harish, aged 50 years, son of Annaiya, D.No.187/2, Bazeer Street, Palamaneri, Chittoor District, Andhra Pradesh, presently detained in the Central Prison, Salem, under Act 14/1982 branded as DRUG OFFENDER *vide* the detention order dated 29.04.2022 in S.C.No.14/2022 on the file of the second respondent herein directing to produce the person or body of the detenu Harish, aged 50 years, son of Annaiya, before this Court and thereafter, set him at liberty from the Central Prison, Salem, by setting aside the above order.

For Petitioner : Mr.B.Vasudevan

For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by N.ANAND VENKATESH, J.]

The petitioner is the brother of the detenu *viz.*, Harish, aged 50 years, son of Annaiya. The detenu has been detained by the 2nd respondent by his order in S.C.No.14/2022 dated 29.04.2022, holding him to be a "Drug Offender", as contemplated under Section 2(e) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this Habeas Corpus Petition.



H.C.P.No.834 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 sponsoring authority has stated in the Arrest Memo at page No.9 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.



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. He further submitted that the detenu was arrested on 18.12.2021 and on completion of the investigation, final report was laid before the Special Court for the Exclusive Trial of Cases under the Essential Commodities Act, 1955, Salem, on 11.02.2022 on time and the same was taken on file as Special C.C.No.96 of 2022 and the case is now at the stage of examination of witnesses.

5. As evidenced from the document in page No.9 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.No.834 of 2022

6. 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.14/2022 dated 29.04.2022, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu viz., Harish, aged 50 years, son of Annaiya, is directed to be released forthwith, unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

J.]

nsd

[P.N.P., J.]

[N.A.V.,

03.01.2023



H.C.P.No.834 of 2022

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The Secretary of Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai-9.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Krishnagiri District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Krishnagiri District.
- 4.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Salem 636 007.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Denkanikottai Police Station,
Krishnagiri District.
- 6.The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public, Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-9.
- 7.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.834 of 2022

P.N.PRAKASH, J.
AND
N.ANAND VENKATESH, J.

nsd

H.C.P.No.834 of 2022

03.01.2023