



HCP(MD)No.1110 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 26.09.2023

CORAM

**THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH
AND
THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR**

H.C.P.(MD)No.1110 of 2023

Rajalakshmi

.. Petitioner / Sister
of the Detenu

Vs.

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

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

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli.

.. Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for records pertaining to the impugned Detention Order H.S.(MD)Confdl No.38/2023 dated 02.03.2023 in detaining the detenu under Section 2(f) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982



HCP(MD)No.1110 of 2023

as a 'Goonda' and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu namely Sankara Nainar, S/o.Paramasivan, Male, aged 22 years, who is detained in Central Prison, Palayamkottai, Tirunelveli District, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.KA.Raamakrishnan

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

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by M.S.RAMESH,J.)

The present Habeas Corpus Petition came up for admission on 04.09.2023 and we had granted six weeks' time for the learned Additional Public Prosecutor to file his counter affidavit. Thereafter, it was brought to our notice that the detention orders in the case of detenus, who were detained under orders passed after the detenu herein was detained under Act 14, have been quashed by this Court. In this background, we are of the view that the present Habeas Corpus Petition can be taken out of turn and



HCP(MD)No.1110 of 2023

accordingly, the matter is listed before us today under the caption “for being spoken to”.

2. The petitioner is the sister of the detenu viz., Sankara Nainar, S/o.Paramasivan, aged about 22 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in H.S.(M)Confdl No.38/2023 dated 02.03.2023 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.

3. 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.

4. Though several grounds have been raised in the Habeas Corpus Petition, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would mainly focus his argument on the ground that the detaining authority, had inferred that if the detenu comes out on bail, there is every possibility of the detenu



HCP(MD)No.1110 of 2023

indulging in further activities in future, which is bereft of particulars and on that score, the detention order is liable to be interfered with.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that investigation in this case has not been completed and final report has not been filed and hence, strongly opposed the Habeas Corpus Petition.

6. The detaining authority, while recording the detenu's involvement in the sole ground case in Crime No.11/2023 had observed that that there is a real possibility of the detenu coming out on bail, since bails are being granted by the appropriate Courts in such cases and had referred to a similar case, wherein, bail was granted to one Ponraj in Cr.M.P.No.229/2017, dated 24.07.2017 by the District Additional Sessions No.1 Court, Thoothukudi. While observing so, the detaining authority had stated that if the detenu comes out on bail, he will indulge in further activities in future, which will be prejudicial to the maintenance of the public order. When the detenu has involved himself in solitary case, which is the ground case and no reference



HCP(MD)No.1110 of 2023

has been made to any other adverse cases, on what basis the detaining authority had apprehended that the detenu would indulge in further activities in future is not known.

7. A co-ordinate Bench of this Court, in the case of ***Jebasta @ Jebasta Gnanamalar Vs. The State of Tamil Nadu and others*** passed in ***H.C.P.(MD).No.1815 of 2022 vide order dated 21.02.2023***, had an occasion to deal with the similar aspect in the following manner:

“4. The possibility of releasing the accused on bail was imminent and if he is released on bail, his presence likely to cause prejudice to the public peace and therefore, the preventive detention order been slapped after due consideration of merit and careful consideration of relevant records. It is stated in the counter that recourse in normal criminal law effectively preventing him from indulging in such activity in future which are prejudice to the maintenance of the public order. The detaining authority has arrived at such a conclusion based on the sole and solitary case against the petitioner that too, arising out of a property dispute which is purely civil in nature and except this one



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.1110 of 2023

case, there is no adverse record against the detenu to infer that he had been indulging in such activity in the past or he will indulge in such activity in future. Mere apprehension that he will indulge in such activity in future is not suffice to invoke the provision of Act 14 of 1982. There must be some prima facie material to arrive at such conclusion. In this case, this Court finds that no such material. Therefore for bereft of supportive documents, the detention order is vitiated.”

Thus, when the detenu did not have any previous or adverse cases as per the detention order, the subjective satisfaction arrived at by the detaining authority, to the effect that the detenu is likely to indulge in further activities in future, is baseless and would amount to non-application of mind. Hence, the impugned order of detention is liable to be quashed.

8. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in H.S.(M)Confdl No.38/2023, dated 02.03.2023 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Sankara Nainar,



HCP(MD)No.1110 of 2023

S/o.Paramasivan, aged about 22 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

(M.S.R.,J.) (M.N.K.,J.)
26.09.2023

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No

vsm

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tuticorin District, Tuticorin.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.1110 of 2023

M.S.RAMESH,J.
and
M.NIRMAL KUMAR,J.

vsm

H.C.P.(MD)No.1110 of 2023

26.09.2023