



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1047 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.1047 of 2022

Muniamma

.. Petitioner

Vs

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

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Tambaram City.

3.The Inspector of Police,
S5 Pallavaram Police Station,
Chennai.

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

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of



H.C.P.No.1047 of 2022

Habeas Corpus to call for the records call for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the second respondent dated 14.05.2022 in No.75/BCDFGISSSV/2022 against the petitioner's husband Krishana S/o.Pappaiya, aged about 50 years, who is confined at Central Prison Puzhal Chennai and set aside the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Parthiban

For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Addl. Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu viz., Krishna S/o.Pappaiya, aged about 50 years. The detenu has been detained by the 2nd respondent by his order dated 14.05.2022 in BCDFGISSSV No.75/2022, 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



H.C.P.No.1047 of 2022

the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents and we have also perused the records carefully.

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.289 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



H.C.P.No.1047 of 2022

that the arrest of the detenu has been intimated to the wife of the detenu through SMS. 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.

5. As evidenced from the document in page No.289 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.

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.1047 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 BCDFGISSSV No.75/2022, dated 14.05.2022, passed by the 2nd respondent is set aside. The detenu viz., Krishna S/o.Pappaiya, aged about 50 years, 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.]

03.01.2023

rka



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1047 of 2022

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

rka

To

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Tambaram City.
- 3.The Inspector of Police,
S5 Pallavaram Police Station,
Chennai.
- 5.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai
- 6.The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras

HCP No.1047 of 2022



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1047 of 2022

03.01.2023