



H.C.P.No.945 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED 09.01.2023

CORAM

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

H.C.P.No.945 of 2022

Rajendran

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate of
Kancheepuram District, Kancheepuram.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Kancheepuram District, Kancheepuram.

4.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

5.State represented by
The Inspector of Police,
Salavakkam Police Station,
Kancheepuram.

.. Respondents



H.C.P.No.945 of 2022

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying

to issue a WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS to call for the records in connection with the order detention passed by the second respondent dated 25.04.2022 in Memo B.C.D.F.G.I.S.S.S.V.No.17/2022 against the petitioner's son Arun @ Attu Arun, aged 24 years, S/o.Rajendran, who is confined at the Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai and set aside the same and consequently direct the respondents to produce the detenu before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Saranraj

For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the father of the detenu viz., Arun @ Attu Arun, aged 24 years, S/o.Rajendran. The detenu has been detained by the 2nd respondent by his order in B.C.D.F.G.I.S.S.S.V.No.17/2022 dated 25.04.2022, holding him 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.197 of the Booklet furnished to the detenu, that the arrest of the detenu has been intimated to the relative of the detenu. However, there is no material to substantiate the service of arrest intimation stated to have been made to the relative 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 relative of the detenu through SMS. However, we find that there are no material particulars to substantiate the same.

5. As evidenced from the document in page No.197 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 relative 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.

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



H.C.P.No.945 of 2022

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 B.C.D.F.G.I.S.S.S.V.No.17/2022 dated 25.04.2022, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu viz., Arun @ Attu Arun, aged 24 years, S/o.Rajendran, is directed to be released forthwith, unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[P.N.P., J.] [N.A.V., J.]
09.01.2023

nsd



H.C.P.No.945 of 2022

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate of
Kancheepuram District, Kancheepuram.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Kancheepuram District, Kancheepuram.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Salavakkam Police Station,
Kancheepuram.
- 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.945 of 2022

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

nsd

H.C.P.No.945 of 2022

09.01.2023