



WEB COPY



H.C.P.Nos.687, 790, 851 & 1229 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 12.09.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **M.SUNDAR**
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **R.SAKTHIVEL**

H.C.P.Nos.687, 790, 851 and 1229 of 2023

Jayashree

.. Petitioner in
H.C.P.No.687 of 2023

Logeshwari

.. Petitioner in
H.C.P.No.790 of 2023

Bhavani

.. Petitioner in
H.C.P.No.851 of 2023

N.Kalaiselvi

.. Petitioner in
H.C.P.No.1229 of 2023

Vs

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 9.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai – 66.
- 4.The Inspector of Police (L & O),

Page Nos.1/23



H.C.P.Nos.687, 790, 851 & 1229 of 2023

K-11 C.M.B.T. Police Station,
Chennai.

.. Respondents in
H.C.P.No.687 of 2023

WEB COPY

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to the Government,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
(Home) Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St. George, Chennai – 9.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Office of the Commissioner of Police
(Goondas Section), Vepery, Chennai – 7.

3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai – 66.

4.The Inspector of Police (L & O),
K-11 Ambattur Estate Police Station,
Chennai.

.. Respondents in
H.C.P. Nos.790 and 851 of 2023

1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St. George, Chennai – 9.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai Police,
Vepery, Periamet, Chennai – 7.

3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai – 66.

4.The Inspector of Police (L & O),
K-11 C.M.B.T. Police Station,
Chennai.

.. Respondents in
H.C.P.No.1229 of 2023



H.C.P.Nos.687, 790, 851 & 1229 of 2023

WEB COPY

Prayer in HCP No.687 of 2023: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ of habeas corpus to call for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the second respondent dated 29.03.2023 in Memo No.78/BCDFGISSSV/2023 against the petitioner's husband Venkatraman, male, aged 48 years, S/o.Loganathan, who is confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu before this Court and set him at liberty.

Prayer in HCP No.790 of 2023: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ of habeas corpus to call for the entire records connected with the order of the second respondent herein in Memo No.81/BCDFGISSSV/2023 dated 29.03.2023 against the petitioner's husband the detenu namely M.Dilip, son of Mathialagan, aged about 30 years, who is confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai and set aside the same, consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the body and person of the detenu before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

Prayer in HCP No.851 of 2023: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ of habeas corpus to call for the entire records connected with the order of the second respondent herein in Memo No.80/BCDFGISSSV/2023 dated 29.03.2023 against the petitioner's brother the detenu namely M.Saravanan, son of Mohan, aged about 29 years, who is confined at



H.C.P.Nos.687, 790, 851 & 1229 of 2023

Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai and set aside the same, consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the body and person of the detenu before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

Prayer in HCP No.1229 of 2023: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ of habeas corpus to call for the records relating to the petitioner's husband under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 vide detention order dated 29.03.2023 on the file of the second respondent herein made in proceedings impugned order No.79/BCDFGISSSV/2023 and quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the second respondent herein to produce the petitioner's husband namely Naveen Gopi @ Gopi, S/o.Mani, aged about 47 years before this Court and set the petitioner's husband at liberty from detention.

For Petitioner	:	Mr.S.Senthilvel assisted by Ms.M.Kokila in H.C.P.No.687 of 2023 Ms.R.Saritha in H.C.P.Nos.790 and 851 of 2023 Mr.Ravindra Ram in H.C.P.No.1229 of 2023
For Respondents	:	Mr.E.Raj Thilak Additional Public Prosecutor in all H.C.Ps



WEB COPY



H.C.P.Nos.687, 790, 851 & 1229 of 2023

COMMON ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by **M.SUNDAR, J.,**]

This common order will now dispose of captioned four 'Habeas Corpus Petitions' ('HCPs' in plural and 'HCP' in singular for the sake of convenience and clarity).

2. 'H.C.P. No.687 of 2023' (hereinafter 'I HCP' for the sake of brevity, convenience and clarity) was listed for admission before this Court on 26.04.2023 and the following order was made:

'H.C.P.No.687 of 2023

M.SUNDAR, J.,

and

M.NIRMAL KUMAR, J.,

(Order of the Court was made by M.SUNDAR, J.,)

Captioned Habeas Corpus Petition has been filed in this Court on 20.04.2023 inter alia assailing a detention order dated 29.03.2023 bearing reference No.78/BCDFGISSSV/2023 made by 'second respondent' [hereinafter 'Detaining Authority' for the sake of convenience and clarity]. To be noted, fourth respondent is the Sponsoring Authority.

2. Wife of detenu is the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that ground case qua the detenu is for alleged offences under Sections 341, 323 and 363 'The Indian Penal Code (45 of 1860)' [hereinafter 'IPC' for the sake of convenience and clarity] in Crime No.109 of 2023 on the file of K-11 C.M.B.T Police Station.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.Nos.687, 790, 851 & 1229 of 2023

4. *The aforementioned detention order has been made on the premise that the detenu is a 'Goonda' under Section 2(f) of 'The Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber law offenders, Drug-offenders, Forest-offenders, Goondas, Immoral traffic offenders, Sand-offenders, Sexual-offenders, Slum-grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 (Tamil Nadu Act No.14 of 1982)' [hereinafter 'Act 14 of 1982' for the sake of convenience and clarity].*

5. *The detention order has been assailed inter alia on the ground that there is variation in the grounds of detention between the English version and Tamil version.*

6. *Prima facie case made out for admission. Admit. Issue Rule nisi returnable by four weeks.*

7. *Mr.R.Muniyapparaj, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, State of Tamil Nadu accepts notice for all respondents. List the captioned Habeas Corpus Petition accordingly.'*

3. 'H.C.P.No.790 of 2023' (hereinafter 'II HCP' for the sake of brevity, convenience and clarity) was listed before another Hon'ble Co-ordinate Bench for admission on 04.05.2023 and the following order was made:

*'Mr.R.Muniyapparaj, learned Addl. Public Prosecutor takes notice for the respondents.
Post the matter after four weeks.'*

4. 'H.C.P.No.851 of 2023' (hereinafter 'III HCP' for the sake of brevity, convenience and clarity) was listed before another Hon'ble Co-ordinate Bench for admission on 17.05.2023 and the following order was made:



H.C.P.Nos.687, 790, 851 & 1229 of 2023

'Admit.

2.Mr.A.Damodaran, learned Additional Public Prosecutor takes notice for the respondents and seeks time to get instructions.

List the matter on 14.06.2023.'

5. 'H.C.P.No.1229 of 2023' (hereinafter 'IV HCP' for the sake of brevity, convenience and clarity) was listed before this Court for admission on 25.07.2023 and the following order was made:

'H.C.P.NO.1229 OF 2023

M.SUNDAR, J.

AND

R.SAKTHIVEL, J.

(Order of the Court was made by M.SUNDAR, J.,)

Captioned Habeas Corpus Petition has been filed in this Court on 04.07.2023 inter alia assailing a 'detention order dated 29.03.2023 bearing reference Memo No.79/BCDFGISSSV/2023' [hereinafter 'impugned preventive detention order' for the sake of convenience and clarity] made by 'second respondent' [hereinafter 'Detaining Authority' for the sake of convenience and clarity]. To be noted, fourth respondent is the Sponsoring Authority.

2.To be noted, wife of detenu is the petitioner.

3.Mr.R.Ravindra Ram, learned counsel on record for petitioner is before us. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that ground case qua the detenu is for alleged offences under Sections 341, 323 and 363 of 'Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Act 45 of 1860)' ['IPC' for brevity] in Crime No.109 of 2023 on the file of K-11 C.M.B.T. Police Station.

4.The aforementioned impugned preventive detention order has been made on the premise that the detenu is a 'Goonda' under Section 2(f) of 'The Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber law offenders, Drug-



WEB COPY



H.C.P.Nos.687, 790, 851 & 1229 of 2023

offenders, Forest-offenders, Goondas, Immoral traffic offenders, Sand-offenders, Sexual-offenders, Slum-grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 (Tamil Nadu Act No.14 of 1982)' [hereinafter 'Act 14 of 1982' for the sake of convenience and clarity].

5.The impugned preventive detention order has been assailed inter alia on the ground that the representation dated 27.04.2023 sent to to the first respondent has been rejected.

6.Prima facie case made out for admission. Admit. Issue Rule nisi returnable by four weeks.

7.Mr.E.Raj Thilak, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, State of Tamil Nadu accepts notice for all respondents. List the captioned Habeas Corpus Petition accordingly.'

6. As regards I HCP and IV HCP, the Admission Board orders capture all essentials i.e., essential facts imperative for appreciating this final order and therefore we are not setting out the facts again in this common final order. As regards II HCP, factual matrix in a nut shell is as follows:

6.1 II HCP has been filed by wife of detenu assailing a 'preventive detention order dated 29.03.2023 bearing reference No.81/BCDFGISSSV/2023' [hereinafter 'impugned preventive detention order' for the sake of convenience and brevity] made by 'second respondent' (hereinafter 'detaining authority' for the sake of convenience). To be noted, fourth respondent is the sponsoring authority.



H.C.P.Nos.687, 790, 851 & 1229 of 2023

WEB COPY

6.2 Impugned preventive detention order has been made under 'The Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber law offenders, Drug-offenders, Forest-offenders, Goondas, Immoral traffic offenders, Sand-offenders, Sexual-offenders, Slum-grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 (Tamil Nadu Act No.14 of 1982)' [hereinafter 'Act 14 of 1982' for the sake of convenience and clarity] on the premise that the detenu is a 'Goonda' within the meaning of Section 2(f) of Act 14 of 1982.

6.3 There is no adverse case. The ground case which is the sole substratum of the impugned preventive detention order is Crime No.109 of 2023 on the file of K-11 CMBT Police Station for alleged offences under Sections 341, 323, 363 of 'The Indian Penal Code (45 of 1860)' [hereinafter 'IPC' for the sake of convenience and clarity] subsequently altered into one under Sections 147, 148, 341, 342, 323, 324, 364(A) and 302 IPC. Owing to the nature of the challenge to the impugned preventive detention order, it is not necessary to delve into the factual matrix or be detained further by facts.



H.C.P.Nos.687, 790, 851 & 1229 of 2023

7. As regards III HCP, factual matrix in a nut shell is as follows:

WEB COPY

7.1 III HCP has been filed by sister of detenu assailing a 'preventive detention order dated 29.03.2023 bearing reference No.80/BCDFGISSSV/2023' [hereinafter 'impugned preventive detention order' for the sake of convenience and brevity] made by 'second respondent' (hereinafter 'detaining authority' for the sake of convenience). To be noted, fourth respondent is the sponsoring authority.

7.2 Impugned preventive detention order has been made under 'The Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber law offenders, Drug-offenders, Forest-offenders, Goondas, Immoral traffic offenders, Sand-offenders, Sexual-offenders, Slum-grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 (Tamil Nadu Act No.14 of 1982)' [hereinafter 'Act 14 of 1982' for the sake of convenience and clarity] on the premise that the detenu is a 'Goonda' within the meaning of Section 2(f) of Act 14 of 1982.



H.C.P.Nos.687, 790, 851 & 1229 of 2023

7.3 There is one adverse case. The ground case which constitutes substantial part of substratum of the impugned preventive detention order is Crime No.109 of 2023 on the file of K-11 CMBT Police Station for alleged offences under Sections 341, 323, 363 of 'The Indian Penal Code (45 of 1860)' [hereinafter 'IPC' for the sake of convenience and clarity] subsequently altered into one under Sections 147, 148, 341, 342, 323, 324, 364(A) and 302 IPC. Owing to the nature of the challenge to the impugned preventive detention order, it is not necessary to delve into the factual matrix or be detained further by facts.

8. As regards II HCP, as would be evident from the Admission Board order dated 04.05.2023, it has become necessary to make a formal order of admission and issue Rule Nisi. With the consent of both sides, the same was done today and as learned State Additional Public Prosecutor has already accepted notice on 04.05.2023, II HCP also is also taken up for final disposal along with other three HCPs.

9. This Court having captured essential facts that are imperative for appreciating this final order now would straight away plunge into



H.C.P.Nos.687, 790, 851 & 1229 of 2023

the point that was canvassed in the final hearing today by Mr.S.Senthilvel, assisted by Ms.M.Kokila, learned counsel for petitioner in I HCP which was supported by Ms.R.Saritha, learned counsel on record for petitioner in II and III HCPs and Mr.Ravindra Ram, learned counsel on record for petitioner in IV HCP.

10. The simple point that is canvassed in petitioners' campaign against four impugned preventive detention orders is that the arrest was on 24.02.2023, remand was on 25.02.2023 and the impugned preventive detention orders have been made on 29.03.2023. In the interregnum, police custody was given vide order dated 03.03.2023, the detenus were produced before the jurisdictional Magistrate post police custody on 05.03.2023 and the remand was extended till 06.04.2023. This extension of remand post police custody has been captured in the grounds of impugned preventive detention orders furnished to the detenus is the case of the petitioners. In support of this contention, learned counsel drew our attention to paragraph 3 of the grounds of impugned preventive detention orders, which reads as follows:

'3....After the police custody, on 05.03.2023, the Inspector of Police re-produced the accused



H.C.P.Nos.687, 790, 851 & 1229 of 2023

Thiru.Venkatraman, Thiru.Saravanan, Thiru.Dilip and Thiru.Naveen Gopi before the Court of learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai – 600 008 and were lodged at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, as remand prisoners. Further, their remand period was extended till 06.04.2023.'

To be noted, the aforesaid portion is *ad verbatim* the same in all four impugned preventive detention orders.

11. Elaborating his submission in this direction, Mr.S.Senthilvel, learned counsel appearing in the I HCP placed before us the case law reported in **2023:MHC:1903** (*Neutral citation of this Hon'ble Court in Suriya Vs. State of Tamil Nadu*) wherein a Division Bench of this Court to which one of us (M.Sundar, J) was a party had dealt with the same point and the articulation in this **2023:MHC:1903** (*Suriya's case*) in paragraphs 5 to 9 is as follows:

'5. In the support affidavit qua captioned HCP, several grounds have been urged/raised but in the hearing one point that was projected in petitioner's campaign against the impugned preventive detention order has weighed with this Court and therefore we shall set out our discussion and dispositive reasoning on the same. Attention of this Court was drawn to one portion of paragraph 2 and the same reads as follows:



WEB COPY



H.C.P.Nos.687, 790, 851 & 1229 of 2023

'After the police custody, on 22.08.2022, the Inspector of Police produced again the accused Thiru.Balaji and Thiru.Santhoshkumar before the Court of learned Vth Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai – 8 and they were remanded to judicial custody. Further, their remand period was extended till 26.09.2022.'

6. Adverting to aforesaid paragraph in the impugned preventive detention order, learned counsel for petitioner submitted that the date of arrest is 15.08.2022, the detenu was remanded to judicial custody till 29.08.2022 but in the interregnum on 16.08.2022, the prosecution sought police custody (page no.409 of the grounds booklet) and police custody was granted from 17.08.2022 to 22.08.2022. The aforementioned paragraph proceeds on the basis that post police custody, the detenu was produced before the jurisdictional Magistrate and the remand was extended till 26.09.2022 but the grounds booklet does not contain any document to support this averment. In response to this, learned State Additional Public Prosecutor on instructions from the sponsoring authority placed before us an order dated 17.08.2022 made by the jurisdictional Magistrate. This order is grant of police custody of the detenu from 17.08.2022 to 22.08.2022 but what happened on 22.08.2022 is not supported by any document whereas the impugned preventive detention order says that the remand was extended till 26.09.2022. Learned counsel took us through pages 381 and 389 of the grounds booklet and relevant portions thereat read as follows:

'Page No.381

REMAND ORDER DATED 18.08.2022

OF V METROPOLITAN MAGISTRATE COURT

Three accused are produced before me at my residence. Grounds of the case explained. No complaints against police. Free legal aid informed. There is no external injuries. Prima-facie case is made out. Remand till 01.09.2022.'



WEB COPY



H.C.P.Nos.687, 790, 851 & 1229 of 2023

'Page No.389

REMAND ORDER DATED 15.09.2022

OF V METROPOLITAN MAGISTRATE COURT

Accused seen on 15.09.2022 through Video Conference. Remand extended till 26.09.2022.'

We find that both these orders pertain to another accused and not to Balaji who is the detenu qua captioned HCP. Therefore, the impugned preventive detention order made on the premise that the detenu was remanded to judicial custody after police custody period elapsed on 22.08.2022 flounders. In this regard, we deem it appropriate to refer to Pramod Singla's case (Pramod Singla Vs. Union of India and Others) decided by Honourable Supreme Court yesterday (10.04.2023) in criminal appeal arising out of S.L.P. (Crl.) No.10798 of 2022. To be noted, on facts, Pramod Singla's case also arises out of preventive detention under COFEPOSA. Therefore, the facts are similar as a preventive detention order was assailed in Pramod Singla's case. In this view of the matter, we deem it appropriate to refer to the ratio of Honourable Supreme Court in Pramod Singla's case and we find that two paragraphs namely paragraph 21 captioned 'Analysis' and the concluding paragraph being paragraph 44 are of relevance and the same read as follows:

'ANALYSIS

21. Before we deal with the issues framed, we find it important to note that preventive detention laws in India are a colonial legacy, and have a great potential to be abused and misused. Laws that have the ability to confer arbitrary powers to the state, must in all circumstances, be very critically examined, and must be used only in the rarest of rare cases. In cases of preventive detention, where the detenu is held in arrest not for a crime he has committed, but for a potential crime he may commit, the Courts must always



WEB COPY



H.C.P.Nos.687, 790, 851 & 1229 of 2023

give every benefit of doubt in favour of the detenu, and even the slightest of errors in procedural compliances must result in favour of the detenu.

CONCLUSION

44. As has been mentioned above, preventive detention laws in India are a colonial legacy, and as such, are extremely powerful laws that have the ability to confer arbitrary power to the state. In such a circumstance, where there is a possibility of an unfettered discretion of power by the Government, this Court must analyze cases arising from such laws with extreme caution and excruciating detail, to ensure that there are checks and balances on the power of the Government. Every procedural rigidity, must be followed in entirety by the Government in cases of preventive detention, and every lapse in procedure must give rise to a benefit to the case of the detenu. The Courts, in circumstances of preventive detention, are conferred with the duty that has been given the utmost importance by the Constitution, which is the protection of individual and civil liberties. This act of protecting civil liberties, is not just the saving of rights of individuals in person and the society at large, but is also an act of preserving our Constitutional ethos, which is a product of a series of struggles against the arbitrary power of the British state.'

7. The ratio is, in preventive detention cases where the detenu is held in arrest not for a crime he has committed but for a potential crime he may commit, the Courts must always give every benefit of doubt in favour of the detenu and even the slightest of errors in procedural compliances must result in favour of the detenu. Therefore, if this ratio is applied with rigour to the case on hand in the



WEB COPY



H.C.P.Nos.687, 790, 851 & 1229 of 2023

light of the narrative thus far, we find that the preventive detention order which has been made on the basis that the detenu was remanded to judicial custody on 22.08.2022 on elapsing of police custody and was so remanded to judicial custody till 26.09.2022 is clearly a flaw in the manner in which the impugned preventive detention order has been made. We also notice that this impairs the right of the detenu to make an effective representation against the impugned preventive detention order and such right of the detenu to make an effective representation against the impugned preventive detention order is a constitutional safeguard enshrined in Clause (5) of Article 22 of the Constitution of India.

8. We remind ourselves that preventive detention is not a punishment and HCP is a high prerogative writ.

9. In the light of discussion and dispositive reasoning thus far, we have no difficulty in saying that the impugned preventive detention order deserves to be dislodged.'

12. In response to the aforementioned argument projected by the protagonist of the captioned HCPs, learned Prosecutor drew our attention to the order dated 03.03.2023 wherein learned Judicial Magistrate V, Egmore has granted police custody with a specific directive to produce detenus before him on 05.03.2023 by 4.00 p.m. (mentioned as பகல் 4 மணிக்குள் ideally it should have been மாலை 4 மணிக்குள்).



H.C.P.Nos.687, 790, 851 & 1229 of 2023

WEB COPY

13. We carefully considered the aforementioned arguments made on both sides. We find that the point is not whether the police custody was given qua four detenus as regards the captioned four HCPs. The point is detaining authority in all the impugned preventive detention orders has articulated the point that post police custody, the detenus were produced before the jurisdictional Magistrate and the jurisdictional Magistrate has extended the remand (obviously judicial custody) upto 06.04.2023 but this extension of remand post police custody order has not been furnished to the detenus. We had the benefit of perusing the grounds booklet served on the four detenus and we find that the submission of the learned counsel for petitioners is indisputable and factually correct. This means that the rights of the detenus to make representation nay effective representation qua impugned preventive detention orders has been impaired. To be noted, right of a detenu to make an effective representation as against the preventive detention order is the constitutional safeguard. It is sanctus/sacrosanct and it is ingrained in Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India. This Court has repeatedly held that infraction of this constitutional safeguard vide Article 22(5) of the Constitution sounds death knell of preventive detention order. In other words,



H.C.P.Nos.687, 790, 851 & 1229 of 2023

preventive detention orders get vitiated and become liable for being dislodged in habeas legal drill when there is a breach of constitutional safeguard ingrained in Article 22(5) of the Constitution. To be noted, this is one of the principles that has been articulated in *Suriya's case* (**2023:MHC:1903**) referred to supra and pressed into service by learned counsel for petitioners as delineated supra.

14. In the light of the narrative, discussion and dispositive reasoning thus far, we have no difficulty in sustaining the proposition that the rights of the detenus i.e., sacrosanct constitutional rights to make effective representation against the impugned preventive detention orders have been infringed and such infraction leaves the impugned preventive detention orders vitiated and liable to be dislodged in the habeas legal drill on hand.

15.1 Ergo, the sequitur is, captioned I HCP is allowed. Impugned preventive detention order dated 29.03.2023 bearing reference No.78/BCDFGISSSV/2023 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Venkatraman, aged 48 years, Son of Thiru.Loganathan, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, if not



H.C.P.Nos.687, 790, 851 & 1229 of 2023

required in connection with any other case / cases. There shall be no order as to costs.

15.2 Apropos, the sequitur is, captioned II HCP is allowed. Impugned preventive detention order dated 29.03.2023 bearing reference No.81/BCDFGISSSV/2023 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Dilip, aged 30 years, Son of Thiru.Mathiyazhagan, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, if not required in connection with any other case / cases. There shall be no order as to costs.

15.3 In the result, captioned III HCP is allowed. Impugned preventive detention order dated 29.03.2023 bearing reference No.80/BCDFGISSSV/2023 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Saravanan, aged 29 years, Son of Thiru.Mohan, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, if not required in connection with any other case / cases. There shall be no order as to costs.

15.4 Finally, captioned IV HCP is allowed. Impugned preventive detention order dated 29.03.2023 bearing reference



H.C.P.Nos.687, 790, 851 & 1229 of 2023

No.79/BCDFGISSSV/2023 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Naveen Gopi, aged 47 years, Son of Thiru.Mani, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, if not required in connection with any other case / cases. There shall be no order as to costs.

(M.S.,J.) (R.S.V.,J.)
12.09.2023

Index : Yes
Neutral Citation : Yes
mmi

P.S: Registry to forthwith communicate this order to Jail authorities in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 9.
- 2.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St. George, Chennai – 9.
- 3.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai – 66.
- 5.The Inspector of Police (L & O),
K-11 C.M.B.T. Police Station,
Chennai.

Page Nos.21/23



H.C.P.Nos.687, 790, 851 & 1229 of 2023

6.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Office of the Commissioner of Police
(Goondas Section), Vepery, Chennai – 7.

7.The Inspector of Police (L & O),
K-11 Ambattur Estate Police Station,
Chennai.

8.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.Nos.687, 790, 851 & 1229 of 2023

**M.SUNDAR, J.,
and
R.SAKTHIVEL, J.,**

mmi

**H.C.P.Nos.687, 790, 851
and 1229 of 2023**

12.09.2023

Page Nos.23/23