



H.C.P.No.1814 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 29.03.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.SUNDAR
and

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR

H.C.P.No.1814 of 2022

Divya Bharathi
D/o.Dinakaran

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Secretary to the Government
Home Prohibition and Excise Dept.,
Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.
2. District Collector and District Magistrate of
Ranipet District, Ranipet-1.
3. The Superintendent of Police
Ranipet District, Ranipet.
4. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Vellore.
5. The Inspector of Police
Timiri Police Station
Ranipet District.

.. Respondents



H.C.P.No.1814 of 2022

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 08.09.2022 in B3/D.O.No.46/2022 against the petitioner's father Dinakaran, male aged 45 years, S/o.Rathinakumar who is confined at Central Prison, Vellore and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu before the Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner	:	Mr.D.Balaji
For Respondents	:	Mr.R.Muniyapparaj Additional Public Prosecutor assisted by Mr.M.Sylvester John, Advocate

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by M.NIRMAL KUMAR, J.,]

Captioned 'Habeas Corpus Petition' ['HCP' for the sake of brevity] has been filed by daughter of the detenu assailing a 'preventive detention order dated 08.09.2022 bearing reference B3/D.O.No.46/2022' [hereinafter 'impugned detention order' for the sake of convenience and brevity]. To be noted, fifth respondent is the sponsoring authority and second respondent is the detaining authority as the impugned detention order has been made by second respondent.



H.C.P.No.1814 of 2022

2. Impugned 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.

3. There is no adverse case. This solitary case which is the sole substratum of the impugned detention order is Crime No.188 of 2022 on the file of Thimiri Police Station for the alleged offences under Sections 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 427, 327, 307 and 302 of 'The Indian Penal Code (45 of 1860)' [hereinafter 'IPC' for the sake of convenience and clarity]. Owing to the nature of the challenge to the impugned detention order, it is not necessary to delve into the factual matrix or be detained further by facts.

4. Mr.D.Balaji, learned counsel on record for petitioner and Mr.R.Muniyapparaj, learned State Additional Public Prosecutor, assisted by



H.C.P.No.1814 of 2022

Mr.M.Sylvester John, learned counsel for all respondents are before us.

WEB COPY

5. The main ground that was raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the arrest of the detenu was not intimated to his near relatives and hence, there is statutory violation which vitiates the impugned detention order passed by the second respondent. To substantiate the same, learned counsel brought to our notice the Arrest Intimation Form (Page Nos.22 and 23 of the booklet).

6. The detenu was arrested in the course of investigation in Crime No.188 of 2022 on 03.08.2022. It is seen from column No.12 of the Arrest Intimation Form that the arrest of the detenu in the ground case was intimated to his son-in-law one Mr.Raja. Insofar as the signature of the witness is concerned, it is blank. There is mention about a mobile number to which SMS was sent. To substantiate the same, there is no other material.



H.C.P.No.1814 of 2022

7. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that the petitioner has not made any representation now putforth before this Court.

Hence, the above contention may not be considered.

8. The Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in the case of ***“Akilandeswari Vs. State, rep. by Secretary to Government, Home, Prohibition and Excise Department, Chennai-600009, reported in 2008 (3) MLJ (Crl.) 744”***, held as follows:

“5. Though the learned Additional Public Prosecutor has made an attempt to justify by stating that the family members were intimated through telegrams, he has not placed any material to satisfy this Court as to whether any telegram was sent and the same was acknowledged either by the family members or relatives of the detenu. A right of intimation to the relatives or family members of the detenu encompasses itself the fundamental right guaranteed under Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India to make a representation to the Detaining Authority or the State Government, as the case may be. In the event the arrest is not intimated, the detenu would not be in a position to make any such representation and in that context, failure on the



part of the Detaining Authority would amount to deprivation of the right of the detenu to make an effective representation guaranteed under Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India. On the facts of this case, a specific averment has been made that the intimation was not given. We also find that the said averment has not been controverted in the Counter Affidavit. Though the learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that the family members of the detenu were informed of the arrest through telegram, there are no materials placed before us to substantiate the said contention. Further, the copy of the telegram has also not been furnished to the detenu. In the absence of the same, we are unable to accept the contention of the learned Additional Public Prosecutor that the family members or the relatives of the detenu were informed of the arrest. Under these circumstances, the detention order is vitiated.”

9. Following ***Akilandeswari*** Case (cited supra), this Court in the case of “***Ganesh @ Lingesan Vs. State of Tamil Nadu and another*** reported in ***2012 (3) MWN (Cr.) 315 DB***”, in paragraph No.10, held as follows:

“10. “No man shall be deprived of his life and liberty except by procedure established by law” has been guaranteed in Article 21 of the Constitution of India. His right to be informed



H.C.P.No.1814 of 2022

of the arrest is his basic human right. Curtailment of his personal freedom in pursuance of a preventive detention law though has the constitutional sanction (see Article 22(3)(b) of the Constitution of India), it is conditioned by many constraints, one of which is a chance for him to make representation as against his detention. (see Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India). If his arrest is not informed to his dear and near ones, who could make representation as against the detention order on his behalf, he cannot exercise the right given to him under Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India. In this constitutional perspective, the argument of the Respondent that by non-supply of a copy of the telegram informing his arrest no prejudice is caused to the detenu is too big a pill to gulp.”

10. In this case, the arrest intimation is through Short Message Service (SMS). The reason given is not acceptable, proper intimation has to be given to the detenu and the detenu must know the reason for his arrest. Further, right of the detenu to make an effective representation qua the preventive detention order is a Constitutional safeguard ingrained in Clause (5) of Article 22 of the Constitution of India. In the light of the narrative thus far, this Constitutional safeguard is hampered. The sequitur is, the



H.C.P.No.1814 of 2022

impugned preventive detention order deserves to be dislodged.

WEB COPY

11. Before concluding, we also remind ourselves that preventive detention is not a punishment and HCP is a high prerogative writ.

12. Apropos, the sequitur is, captioned HCP is allowed. Impugned detention order dated 08.09.2022 bearing reference B3/D.O.No.46/2022 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Dinakaran, aged 45 years, son of Thiru.Rathinakumar, 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.)

(M.N.K.,J.)

29.03.2023

Index : Yes

Speaking

Neutral Citation : Yes

mk

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

Page Nos.8/10



H.C.P.No.1814 of 2022

To

WEB COPY

1. The Secretary to the Government
Home Prohibition and Excise Dept.,
Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.
2. District Collector and District Magistrate of
Ranipet District, Ranipet-1.
3. The Superintendent of Police
Ranipet District, Ranipet.
4. The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Vellore.
5. The Inspector of Police
Timiri Police Station
Ranipet District.
6. The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.1814 of 2022

M.SUNDAR, J.,
and
M.NIRMAL KUMAR, J.,

mk

H.C.P.No.1814 of 2022

29.03.2023

Page Nos.10/10