



WEB COPY



HCP.No.965 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 05.06.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.965 of 2024

Mr.Stevewaugh

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State,
represented by the
The Commissioner of Police,
Tambaram, Tamil Nadu.

2.The Assistant Commissioner of Police,
Guduvanchery, Tamil Nadu.

3.The Deputy Commissioner of Police,
Guduvanchery, Tamil Nadu.

4.The Inspector of Police,
Vandalur-AWPS Police Station,
Vandalur, Tamil Nadu.

5.The Commissioner of Police,
Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu.

6.Chandrasekar

... Respondents



HCP.No.965 of 2024

PRAAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, directing the respondents herein, to produce the petitioner's wife Mrs.Eniya Geetha aged 22 years, before this Hon'ble Court and from the custody of the 6th respondent and set her at liberty.

For Petitioner	: No appearance
For Respondents	: Mr.E.Raj Thilak, Additional Public Prosecutor assisted by Mr.C. Aravind

ORDER

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

For the main prayer in the present Habeas Corpus Petition, seeking for issuance of Habeas Corpus by directing the respondents to produce the petitioner's wife Eniya Geetha from the custody of the sixth respondent herein and set her at liberty, the petitioner has earlier filed HCP.No.928 of 2024. This Habeas Corpus Petition came to be dismissed by holding that the prayer itself is a abuse of judicial process, with a cost of Rs.10,000/- to be paid to the Tamil Nadu Legal Services Authority, Chennai. The said order reads as follows;

*“Complaining that the petitioner's wife had
been illegally detained by the third respondent and*



WEB COPY



HCP.No.965 of 2024

his family, he has given several complaints to the respondent Police and the same was registered under the caption “family quarrel”. Since the Police has not taken any action to bring back his wife, he has chosen to file the present Habeas Corpus Petition.

2. Admittedly, the petitioner's wife is a major by age and according to the petitioner, his wife is in the illegal custody of her parental family. Such a statement cannot be considered when a person who is alleged to be in the illegal custody, is staying at her parents home and the same cannot be deemed to be an illegal detention.

3. The consequential issue that arises is as to whether Article 226 of the Constitution of India can be invoked for issuance of a Writ in the nature of Habeas Corpus, when the aspect of “illegal detention” is conspicuously absent.

4. A Writ in the nature of Habeas Corpus is a prerogative Writ by virtue of which the cause and validity of detention of a person are investigated by a summary procedure. There are certain basic principles for assuming jurisdiction while dealing with a Writ of Habeas Corpus.

5. When an authority holding custody of the



detenu, fails to satisfy the Court with regard to the deprivation of his personal liberty, then a Writ of Habeas Corpus will be issued to set the alleged detenu at liberty. However, when the authority satisfies the Court that the detention was through established procedure of law and such detention being legal, then in such cases, a Writ of Habeas Corpus will not be issued. These situations usually arise in cases of preventive detention.

6. In cases of illegal detention of someone, at the behest of another person and the detenu is deprived of his/her liberty, a Writ of Habeas Corpus could be issued to set forth the detenu at liberty. In such non-statutory cases, this Court may direct the person who has detained another person, to produce the latter before the Court, so as to enable the Court to know on what ground he/she has been detained. On being satisfied that a person, who is a major by age, has been detained against his/her choice or willingness and has been deprived of his/her personal liberty, the Court may then subject him/her at liberty.

7. In the case of 'Soni Gerry Vs. Gerry Douglas' reported in '(2018) 2 SCC 197', the



Hon'ble Supreme Court, while dealing with a case where the daughter of the petitioner therein, who was a major by age, had expressed her desire to reside in Kuwait, where she was pursuing her education, it was observed thus:-

“9..... She has, without any hesitation, clearly stated that she intends to go back to Kuwait to pursue her career. In such a situation, we are of the considered opinion that as a major, she is entitled to exercise her choice and freedom and the Court cannot get into the aspect whether she has been forced by the father or not. There may be ample reasons on her behalf to go back to her father in Kuwait, but we are not concerned with her reasons. What she has stated before the Court, that alone matters and that is the heart of the reasoning for this Court, which keeps all controversies at bay.

10. It needs no special emphasis to state that attaining the age of majority in an individual's life has its own significance. She/He is entitled to make her/his choice. The courts cannot, as long as the choice remains,



HCP.No.965 of 2024

assume the role of parens patriae. The daughter is entitled to enjoy her freedom as the law permits and the court should not assume the role of a super guardian being moved by any kind of sentiment of the mother or the egotism of the father. We say so without any reservation.”

8. In the case of 'Mohd. Ikram Hussain Vs. State of U.P.' reported in '**AIR 1964 SC 1625**', it was observed that a Writ of Habeas Corpus is a Writ of right and not a Writ of course and may be granted only on reasonable grounds or probable cause being shown. In '**Kanu Sanyal Vs. District Magistrate, Darjeeling**' reported in '**(1973) 2 SCC 674**', the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that the object of a Writ of Habeas Corpus is to secure release of a person, who is illegally restrained of his liberty.

9. The exercise of the extraordinary jurisdiction for issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus would, therefore, be seen to be dependent on the jurisdictional fact that the applicant establishes a prima facie case that the detention is unlawful. It is only where the aforementioned jurisdictional fact is



WEB COPY



HCP.No.965 of 2024

*established that the applicant becomes entitled to a Writ, as of right, as held in the case of '**Rajeswari Chandrasekar Ganesh Vs. State of Tamil Nadu and Others**' reported in '**(2022) SCC OnLine SC 885**'. Thus, the petition seeking for such a relief should prima facie disclose that a person is under illegal detention by someone and only on satisfaction of the same, the Court will proceed to issue a Writ for production of the person from such illegal detention.*

10. If that be so, we are unable to appreciate the conduct on the part of the petitioner in having invoked Article 226 of the Constitution of India, which Habeas Corpus Petition is apparently not maintainable.

11. The petitioner has abused the due process of law, more particularly, when an alternate remedy under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure is also available to him. Thus, we are of the view that cost could be imposed on the petitioner for having abused the due process of law.

12. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition stands dismissed with a cost of Rs.10,000/-, which amount shall be paid by the petitioner to the Tamil Nadu State Legal Services Authority, Chennai, within



*a period of four (4) weeks from the date of receipt of
a copy of this order.”*

2.It is now stated by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor that the dismissal of the earlier HCP.No.928 of 2024 has been suppressed by the petitioner.

3.It is seen that the present Habeas Corpus has been moved before the vacation Court. Hence. we are of the view that the petitioner has once again abused the due process of law by suppressing the dismissal of the earlier Habeas Corpus Petition. In this background, the present Habeas Corpus Petition also requires to be dismissed for the same reasons assigned in the earlier order. In view of the suppression of the earlier Habeas Corpus Petition, exemplary cost can be imposed in the present Habeas Corpus Petition.

4.Accordingly, the present Habeas Corpus Petition is dismissed with a cost of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand only), which amount shall be paid by the petitioner to the Chief Justice Relief Fund, within a period of four (4) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.965 of 2024

[M.S.R., J]

[S.M., J]

05.06.2024

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Internet: Yes/No
Tsg

To

- 1.The State,
represented by the
The Commissioner of Police,
Tambaram, Tamil Nadu.
- 2.The Assistant Commissioner of Police,
Guduvanchery, Tamil Nadu.
- 3.The Deputy Commissioner of Police,
Guduvanchery, Tamil Nadu.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
Vandalur-AWPS Police Station,
Vandalur, Tamil Nadu.
- 5.The Commissioner of Police,
Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu.
- 6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.965 of 2024

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and
SUNDER MOHAN, J.

Tsg

H.C.P.No.965 of 2024



WEB COPY



HCP.No.965 of 2024

05.06.2024