



H.C.P.No.2054 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 06.04.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **M.SUNDAR**
and
THE HONOURABLE DR.JUSTICE **D.NAGARJUN**

H.C.P.No.2054 of 2022

Karpagam

.. Petitioner

Vs

1.The State of Tamil Nadu

Rep. By its Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 9.

2.The Commissioner of Police,

Avadi City, Office of the Commissioner of Police,
(Goondas Section), Avadi,
Chennai - 600 054.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,

Central Prison II, Puzhal,
Chennai - 600 066.

4.The Inspector of Police,

T-12, Poonamallee Police Station,
Thiruvallur District.

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India
praying for issuance of a writ of habeas corpus calling for the records
in connection with the order of detention passed by the second

Page Nos.1/8



H.C.P.No.2054 of 2022

respondent on 14.09.2022 in BCDFGISSSV No.118/2022 against the detenu Sunal @ Koteeswaran, son of Kutty, male, aged about 24 years, who is now confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai (the 3rd respondent herein) and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Paarthiban
for Mr.P.Parthipan

For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Additional Public Prosecutor
assisted by Mr.M.Sylvester John

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by **M.SUNDAR, J.,**]

Captioned 'Habeas Corpus Petition' ['HCP' for the sake of brevity] has been filed by mother of detenu assailing a 'preventive detention order dated 14.09.2022 bearing No.118/BCDFGISSSV/2022' [hereinafter 'impugned detention order' for the sake of convenience and brevity]. To be noted, fourth respondent is the sponsoring authority and second respondent is the detaining authority as impugned detention order has been made by second respondent.

2. Impugned detention order has been made under 'The Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber law



H.C.P.No.2054 of 2022

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 are two adverse cases. The ground case which is the sole substratum of the impugned detention order is Crime No.450 of 2022 on the file of T-12 Poonamallee Police Station for alleged offences under Sections 147, 148, 341, 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.V.Paarthiban, learned counsel representing counsel on record for petitioner and Mr.R.Muniyapparaj, learned State Additional Public Prosecutor assisted by Mr.M.Sylvester John, learned counsel, for all respondents are before us.



H.C.P.No.2054 of 2022

5. In the support affidavit qua captioned HCP, very many averments have been raised/urged. Be that as it may, in the hearing, Mr.V.Paarthiban, learned counsel appearing on behalf of counsel on record for petitioner posited his argument on one submission which found favour with us and that one submission turns on the subjective satisfaction arrived at by the detaining authority as regards the imminent possibility of the detenu being enlarged on bail. In this regard, learned counsel for petitioner took us through paragraph 4 of the grounds of detention and pointed out that subjective satisfaction as regards imminent possibility has been arrived at by the detaining authority by relying on what according to the detaining authority is the steps being taken by the 'relatives' of the detenu for filing bail application on behalf of the detenu. Learned counsel thereafter took us through the grounds of detention which has been served on the detenu and pointed out there is special report from the sponsoring authority at pages 249 and 250 of the booklet and that special report itself is dated 15.09.2022 whereas the impugned detention order is dated 14.09.2022. The simple submission of learned counsel for petitioner is, this is a clear case of non-application of mind and the impugned detention order is flawed as the 15.09.2022 special report obviously



H.C.P.No.2054 of 2022

could not have been before the detaining authority on 14.09.2022. We have no difficulty in accepting this submission as it is clear as day light.

6. However, learned State Additional Public Prosecutor submitted to the contrary and he drew our attention to page No. 248 of the booklet where there is a 161(3) Cr.P.C. statement from the mother of the detenu and this statement is dated 14.09.2022. Learned State Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that it is quite possible to record 161(3) Cr.P.C. statement on 14.09.2022. In response to this, learned counsel for petitioner submitted that the impugned detention order does not talk about the statement from the mother of the detenu but it talks about the statement from the relatives. Be that as it may, there is one other point which weighed in our mind and that one other point is impugned preventive detention order has been served on the detenu at 16:40 hours on 14.09.2022. It is extremely unlikely that the statement recorded on 14.09.2022 could have been, in other words, a neatly calico bound booklet placed before the detaining authority on the same day. However, we do not propose to enter into this area of surmises and conjectures as the special report is as clear as day light.



H.C.P.No.2054 of 2022

7. In the light of the discussion and dispositive reasoning set out supra, we have no difficulty in coming to the conclusion that the impugned preventive detention order deserves to be dislodged.

8. Apropos, the sequitur is, captioned HCP is allowed. Impugned detention order dated 14.09.2022 bearing reference No.118/BCDFGISSSV/2022 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Sunal @ Koteeswaran, male, aged 24 years, son of Thiru.Kutty 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.) (D.N.R.,J.)
06.04.2023

Index : Yes / No
Neutral Citation : Yes / No
mmi

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

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 9.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Avadi City, Office of the Commissioner of Police,

Page Nos.6/8



H.C.P.No.2054 of 2022

(Goondas Section), Avadi,
Chennai – 600 054.

WEB COPY

- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison II, Puzhal,
Chennai – 600 066.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
T-12, Poonamallee Police Station,
Thiruvallur District.
- 5.The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.No.2054 of 2022

**M.SUNDAR, J.,
and
Dr.D.NAGARJUN , J.,**

mmi

H.C.P.No.2054 of 2022

06.04.2023

Page Nos.8/8