



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.994 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.994 of 2022

Selvi

.. Petitioner

Vs.

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

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

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

4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Coimbatore.

5.The Inspector of Police,
Avinashipalayam Police Station,
Tiruppur District.

.. Respondents



H.C.P.No.994 of 2022

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

WEB COPY

issue a WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS to call for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the second respondent dated 13.05.2022 in Cr.M.P.No.27/GOONDA/2022 against the petitioner's son Karthik @ Karthikeyan, male, aged 37 years, S/o.Kumaravel, who is confined at the Central Prison, Coimbatore and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Balaji

For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu viz., Karthik @ Karthikeyan, male, aged 37 years, S/o.Kumaravel. The detenu has been detained by the 2nd respondent by his order in Cr.M.P.No.27/GOONDA/2022 dated 13.05.2022, 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.



H.C.P.No.994 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.93 of the Booklet furnished to the detenu, that the arrest of the detenu has been intimated to the brother of the detenu. However, there is no material to substantiate the service of arrest intimation stated to have been made to the brother 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 brother of the detenu over phone. However, we find that there are no material particulars to substantiate the same.

5. As evidenced from the document in page No.93 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 brother of the detenu over phone, 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.994 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 Cr.M.P.No.27/GOONDA/2022 dated 13.05.2022, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu viz., Karthik @ Karthikeyan, male, aged 37 years, S/o.Kumaravel, 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.994 of 2022

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Tiruppur District, Tiruppur.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Tiruppur District, Tiruppur.
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Coimbatore.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Avinashipalayam Police Station,
Tiruppur 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.994 of 2022

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

nsd

H.C.P.No.994 of 2022

03.01.2023