



H.C.P.(MD) No.1305 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 29.03.2023

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.SURESH KUMAR

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN

H.C.P.(MD)No.1305 of 2022

Mohamed Ovuthu

... Petitioner / Father of Detenu

Vs.

1.The Principal Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.

2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Pudukottai District,
Pudukottai.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirapalli.

...Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to
issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records pertaining to the



H.C.P.(MD) No.1305 of 2022

impugned detention order passed by the 2nd respondent made in his proceedings in P.D.O. No.36/2022 dated 22.07.2022 in detaining the detenu under Section 2(f) of the Tamilnadu Act 14 of 1982 as a Goonda and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the Detenu namely Sheik Mohamed Yusuf S/o. Mohamed Ouvud, Male, aged about 32 years, who is detained in Central Prison, Tiruchirapalli, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.M.Karunakaran
for M/s.J.Sulthan Basha

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by ***R.SURESH KUMAR, J.***)

This Habeas Corpus Petition has been filed to call for the records pertaining to the impugned detention order passed by the 2nd respondent made in his proceedings in P.D.O. No.36/2022 dated 22.07.2022 in detaining the detenu under Section 2(f) of the Tamilnadu Act 14 of 1982 as a Goonda and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu, namely, Sheik Mohamed Yusuf S/o. Mohamed Ouvud, Male, aged about 32 years, who is detained in Central Prison, Tiruchirapalli, before this Court and set him at liberty.



2. We have heard Mr.K.M.Karunakaran, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, appearing for the respondents.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, among various grounds, has projected one as a major ground, under which, he pointed that, normally within the purview of the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Boot-leggers, Cyber Law Offenders, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Sexual Offenders, Slum grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 (hereinafter referred to as Act 14 of 1982) detention order would be passed by the detaining authority solely on the basis of the report / request / recommendation submitted by the sponsoring authority from the concerned police or district concerned.

4. What are the documents placed before the detaining authority are expected to be gone through by the detaining authority and based on his/her subjective satisfaction the invocation of the provisions of Act 14 of 1982 would be undertaken.



5. However, in a complete deviation of the said method of invoking the provisions of Act 14 of 1982, in this case, the detaining authority i.e., the second respondent in the grounds of detention has stated that, a report was requested from the Sub-Divisional Magistrate and Revenue Divisional Officer, Aranthangi, and he has recommended and submitted a report that he is a deserving person for detention.

6. Hence, on the basis of the report submitted by the Sub-Divisional Magistrate / Revenue Divisional Officer, Aranthangi, and on the basis of documents submitted before the detaining authority, it has been ordered to detain the detenu for the purpose of protecting the life and belongings of general public.

7. Therefore, the main reason, according to the detaining authority, is the report submitted by the said officer, in this case, the Revenue Divisional Officer of Aranthangi.

8. When this was pointed out, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents has produced the relevant file as



directed by this Court, where we were able to find out the report received from the said authority viz., Revenue Divisional Officer, Aranthangi, where he has given a simple report about what the information he has gathered about the detenu and ultimately has made a recommendation that the detenu is a person against whom Act 14 of 1982 can be invoked and he can be branded as a Goonda.

9. However, the said report has not been furnished to the detenu and more over the said report has been taken as one of the main criteria to have the subjective satisfaction on the part of the detaining authority, which is outside the purview of the sponsoring authority's document placed before the detaining authority for his/her consideration.

10. When such extra documents or materials are taken into account by the detaining authority, other than the materials and documents furnished by or placed by the sponsoring authority, that itself is against the procedures contemplated under the provisions of the Act 14 of 1982.



11. Assuming that discretely certain informations had been collected by the detaining authority in order to have the subjective satisfaction, those informations collected, especially, the document like the report submitted by the Sub-Divisional Magistrate etc., which are relied upon by the detaining authority, those documents are necessarily to be furnished to the detenu and in this case nothing has been revealed and no document to that effect has been furnished or supplied to the detenu.

12. Therefore, we have no hesitation to hold that, the manner and method as well as the modus operandi adopted by the detaining authority to come to such a conclusion based on the alleged subjective satisfaction on her part to slap the provisions of Act 14 of 1982, against the detenu and ultimately declaring him as Goonda, within the said provisions of the Act is totally against the accepted procedure as contemplated under the provisions of Act 14 of 1982.

13. Therefore, for this reason alone, the impugned detention order would not sustain in the legal scrutiny. Hence, it is to be interfered with.



H.C.P.(MD) No.1305 of 2022

14. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The order of detention passed by the second respondent, in P.D.O. No.36 of 2022 dated 22.07.2022, is set aside. Consequently, the detenu, namely, Sheik Mohamed Yusuf, son of Mohamed Ouvud, aged about 32 years, who is now detained at Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli, is directed to be released forthwith unless his presence or custody or detention is required in connection with any other case.

(R.S.K., J.) & (K.K.R.K, J.)
29.03.2023

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
SJ

To

1.The Principal Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.

2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Pudukottai District,
Pudukottai.

7/8



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD) No.1305 of 2022

R.SURESH KUMAR, J.
AND
K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN, J.

SJ

- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirapalli.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

H.C.P.(MD)No.1305 of 2022

29.03.2023