



WEB COPY



HCP No.1788 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.1788 of 2022

Poongothai
W/o.Purushothaman

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Government of Tamil Nadu
rep. by its Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St George, Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Avadi Police Commissionerate,
Avadi, Chennai – 600 054.

3.The Inspector of Police (L&O)
T3- Korattur Police Station,
Korattur, Chennai – 600 080.

4.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison II,
Puzhal, Chennai – 600 066.

... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus call for the records of the detention made in Memo



HCP No.1788 of 2022

No.60/BCDFGISSSV/2022 dated 23.06.2022 passed by the Commissioner of Police, Avadi, the second respondent herein and confirmed by the first respondent, and to produce the detenu Prakash @ Thalapathy Prakash S/o.Purushothaman, aged about 27 years confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this Court and set aside the same and set the detenu at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Krishnamurthy
For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu, Prakash @ Thalapathy Prakash S/o.Purushothaman, aged 27 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in No.60/BCDFGISSSV/2022 dated 23.06.2022, 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.



WEB COPY

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.111 of the Booklet furnished to the detenu, that the arrest of the detenu has been intimated to the mother of the detenu through SMS. However, there is no material to substantiate the service of arrest intimation stated to have been made to the mother of the detenu through SMS. 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 mother 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.111 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 mother 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 mother 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



HCP No.1788 of 2022

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 No.60/BCDFGISSSV/2022 dated 23.06.2022, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Prakash @ Thalapathy Prakash, S/o.Purushothaman, aged 27 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,
Fort St George, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Avadi Police Commissionerate,
Avadi, Chennai – 600 054.



WEB COPY



HCP No.1788 of 2022

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

SSR

3.The Inspector of Police (L&O)
T3- Korattur Police Station,
Korattur, Chennai – 600 080.

4.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison II,
Puzhal, Chennai – 600 066.

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

7.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.1788 of 2022

03.01.2023