



HCP No.1702 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.1702 of 2022

B.Priya
W/o.Balamurugan

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The State of Tamil Nadu
represented by its
Secretary to Government,
Home [Prohibition and Excise] Department,
Tamil Nadu Government Chief Secretariat,
Fort Saint George, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.District Collector and District Magistrate,
Kancheepuram District, Kancheepuram.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Kancheepuram District.
- 4.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai – 600 066.



HCP No.1702 of 2022

5. The Inspector of Police,
Sriperumbudur Police Station,
Sriperumbudur.

... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the records in Rc.No.8428/2022/M6-D.O.No.22/2022 dated 25.05.2022 on the file of the 2nd respondent, quash the same and direct the production of the detainee detained in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, under the Act 14 of 1982 before this Court and set the detainee-Bala @ Balamurugan, male, aged about 29 years, S/o.Munusamy, set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Percivul Pericles
For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Made by **P.N.PRAKASH, J.**]

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu, Bala @ Balamurugan S/o.Munusamy, aged 29 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Rc.No.8428/2022/M6-D.O.No.22/2022 dated



HCP No.1702 of 2022

WEB COPY

25.05.2022, 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.

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 page No.103 of the Booklet furnished to the detenu, that the arrest of the detenu has been intimated to the wife of the detenu through SMS. However, there is no material to substantiate the service of arrest intimation stated to have been made to the wife of the detenu through SMS. Therefore, it is stated that the detenu was



HCP No.1702 of 2022

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.

5. 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.

6. As evidenced from the document in page No.103 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



HCP No.1702 of 2022

WEB COPY

said intimation was sent through Thapal or Registered post or as per the procedure laid down. Therefore, non-furnishing of details given to the wife 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.

7. 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 Rc.No.8428/2022/M6-D.O.No.22/2022 dated 25.05.2022, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Bala @



HCP No.1702 of 2022

WEB COPY

Balamurugan, S/o.Munusamy, aged 29 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[PNP, J.] [NAV, J.]
03.01.2023

Index: Yes/No
gm/ssr

To

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Home [Prohibition and Excise] Department,
Tamil Nadu Government Chief Secretariat,
Fort Saint George, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.District Collector and District Magistrate,
Kancheepuram District, Kancheepuram.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Kancheepuram District.
- 4.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai – 600 066.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Sriperumbudur Police Station,
Sriperumbudur.

6/8



HCP No.1702 of 2022

WEB COPY

6.The Joint Secretary to Government of Tamil Nadu,
Public, Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 9.

7.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP No.1702 of 2022

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

SSR

H.C.P.No.1702 of 2022

03.01.2023