



WEB COPY



HCP No.2255 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 20.04.2023

Coram

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice **M.SUNDAR**
and

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice **M.NIRMAL KUMAR**

H.C.P. No.2255 of 2022

Mrs.Palaniyammal
W/o.P.Chinnasamy

.. Petitioner /
Wife of detenu

Vs.

- 1.The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. By its Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort. St.George
Chennai -600 009.
- 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector
Erode
3. The Chairman
Advisory Board
No.32, Rajaji Salai
Singaravelar Maligai
Ground Floor (backside entrance)
Chennai Collectorate
Chennai – 600 001



HCP No.2255 of 2022

4. The Superintendent of Police
Center Prison
Coimbatore

5. The Superintendent of Police
Superintendent of Police Office
Erode

6. The Inspector of Police
Vellithiruppur Police Station

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ of habeas corpus to call for the entire records relating to the petitioner's husband detention under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 vide detention order dated 29.08.2022 on the file of the second respondent herein made in proceedings Memo Cr.M.P.No.27/Sand Offender/2022/C1, quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's husband namely Chinnasamy, son of Periyasamy, aged 36 years before this Court and set the petitioner's husband at liberty from detention, now the petitioner's husband is detained at Central Prison, Coimbatore.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Sesubalan Raja

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

ORDER

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

Captioned 'Habeas Corpus Petition' [hereinafter 'HCP' for the sake of convenience and brevity] has been filed by the wife of the detenu assailing



HCP No.2255 of 2022

'detention order dated 29.08.2022 bearing reference Cr.M.P.No.27/Sand Offender/2022 C1' [hereinafter 'impugned detention order' for the sake of convenience]. To be noted, the fifth respondent is the sponsoring authority and the second respondent is the detaining authority as impugned detention order has been made by the second respondent.

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 'Sand Offender' within the meaning of Section 2(gg) of Act 14 of 1982.

3.There are three adverse cases. The ground case which is the sole substratum of the impugned detention order is Crime No.197 of 2022 on the file of Vellithiruppur Police Station for alleged offences under Sections 379 of 'The Indian Penal Code (45 of 1860)' [hereinafter 'IPC' for the sake of



HCP No.2255 of 2022

convenience and clarity] and 21(1) of Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957. 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.P.Sesubalan Raja, learned counsel on record for petitioner and Mr.R.Muniyapparaj, learned Additional Public Prosecutor assisted by Mr.M.Sylvester John learned counsel for respondents are before us.

5.Learned counsel for petitioner predicated his campaign against the impugned detention order on one short point and that is, in the Arrest Intimation it is recorded that the arrest of the detenu was informed to the wife of the detenu Palaniyammal by way of SMS but on the other hand, there is no signature of the detenu's wife and further there is no material to show that mobile number found therein belongs to the detenu's wife, thereby hampered the right of the detenu to make an effective representation.



HCP No.2255 of 2022

6.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that the petitioner has not made any such representation now putforth before this Court. Hence, the above contention may not be considered.

7.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.”

8.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



HCP No.2255 of 2022

except by procedure established by law” has been guaranteed in Article 21 of the Constitution of India. His right to be informed 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.”

9. 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



HCP No.2255 of 2022

(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 impugned preventive detention order deserves to be dislodged.

10.Ergo, the sequitur is, captioned HCP is allowed and the detention order dated 29.08.2022 bearing reference Cr.M.P.No.27/Sand Offender/2022 C1 made by the second respondent is set aside and the detenu Thiru.Chinnasamy, aged 36 years, son of Thiru.Periyasamy is directed to be set at liberty forthwith unless required in connection with any other case. There shall be no order as to costs.

(M.S,J.) (M.N.K.,J.)
20.04.2023

Index : Yes / No
Speaking / Non-speaking
Neutral Citation : Yes / No
gpa

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



HCP No.2255 of 2022

WEB COPY

- To
1. The Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort. St. George
Chennai -600 009.
 2. The District Magistrate and District Collector
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector
Erode
 3. The Chairman
Advisory Board
No.32, Rajaji Salai
Singaravelar Maligai
Ground Floor (backside entrance)
Chennai Collectorate
Chennai – 600 001
 4. The Superintendent of Police
Center Prison
Coimbatore
 5. The Superintendent of Police
Superintendent of Police Office
Erode
 6. The Inspector of Police
Vellithiruppur Police Station
 7. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras, Chennai - 104.



WEB COPY



HCP No.2255 of 2022

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

gpa

H.C.P.No.2255 of 2022

20.04.2023