



HCP.No.2421 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 22.10.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

H.C.P.No.2421 of 2024

Ramesh

... Petitioner/Father of the
Detenu

Vs.

1. The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St.George,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Mayiladuthurai,
Mayiladuthurai.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Mayiladuthurai,
mayiladuthurai District.
4. The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirapally.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Manalmedu Police Station,
Mayiladuthurai District.

... Respondents



HCP.No.2421 of 2024

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 order of the 2nd respondent dated 31.07.2024 in COC No.31/2024 detaining the detenu Thiru.Ranjith, S/o. Ramesh, aged 29 years, as GOONDA under Tamil Nadu Act 14/1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the said detenu now detained in the Central Prison, Tiruchirapally, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Ms.Mythili Srinivas

For Respondents : Mr. E. Raj Thilak
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The preventive detention order passed by the second respondent dated 31.07.2024 is sought to be quashed in the present habeas corpus petition.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.



HCP.No.2421 of 2024

3. Delay in considering the representation is vital, more specifically in preventive detention cases. The detention power conferred under Act is extremely powerful and that have the ability to confer arbitrary power to the State. In such circumstances, where there is a possibility of an unfettered discretion of power by the Government, the Court must analyse cases arising from such laws with extreme caution and excruciate detail power to ensure that there are check, and balances on the power of the Government. Every procedural rigidity must be followed in entirety by the Government in cases of preventive detention and every lapse in procedure must give raise to benefit to the cases of detainee. The Courts in such circumstances of preventive detention, are conferred with a duty that has been given the utmost importance by the Constitution of India, which is the protection of individual and civil liberties. Therefore, the adherence of the procedures and the Rules and the opportunities to be afforded to the detainee are of paramount importance and a constitutional mandate. Therefore, every lapse in exercising the power identified are to be viewed seriously.



HCP.No.2421 of 2024

4. High Court in exercise of powers of Judicial Review under

Article 226 in the case of habeas corpus is not expected to assess the nature of the seriousness of the criminal cases registered and pending against the detainee. The cases of preventive detention are to be dealt with in accordance with the personal liberty of the detainee granted under Part-III of the constitution. Therefore, the dealing of preventive detention cases are not comparable with reference to the regular criminal cases. The cases under preventive detention stands in different footing than that of the regular criminal cases wherein the procedures are distinct and different. Thus, High Court is expected to exercise its powers meticulously to scrutinise, whether there is any lapses on the part of the detaining Authority and the power has been exercised judiciously by scrupulously following the procedures and application of mind has been made as required under law and the breach of public order likely to be caused by the detainee. It is held that mere law and order cannot be a ground to detain a person. The likelihood of causing disturbance to public order, which must be the subjective satisfaction of the detaining Authority while passing the order of detention.



HCP.No.2421 of 2024

5. Admittedly, in the present case, there is a delay of five days in considering the representation and that is not disputed by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor. The delay in considering the representation undoubtedly caused infringement of the right of personal liberty of the detenu under Article 21 of the constitution of India. Thus, the order of detention do not stand under the scrutiny of law.

6. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent in proceedings C.O.C.No.31/2024 dated 31.07.2024 is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is **allowed**. The detenu viz., Ranjith, aged 29/2024, S/o. Ramesh confined at Central Prison, Thiruchirappalli is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.

[S.M.S., J.] [V.S.G., J.]
22.10.2024

Index : Yes/No
Speaking Order : Yes/No
Neutral Citation : Yes/No
veda



HCP.No.2421 of 2024

To

WEB COPY

1. The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St.George,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law and Order) Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 9.
3. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Mayiladuthurai,
Mayiladuthurai.
4. The Superintendent of Police,
Mayiladuthurai,
mayiladuthurai District.
5. The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirapally.
6. The Inspector of Police,
Manalmedu Police Station,
Mayiladuthurai District.
7. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court,
Chennai - 104.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.2421 of 2024

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.
AND
V.SIVAGNANAM, J.

veda

H.C.P.No.2421 of 2024

22.10.2024