



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Dated : 29.04.2015

Coram

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.SELVAM

and

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V.S.RAVI

H.C.P.(MD)No.13 of 2015

Vijayan

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 9.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
O/o. Commissioner of Police,
Madurai City, Madurai.

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

.. Respondents

Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus to call for entire records pertaining to the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent in No.93/BCDFGISSSV/2014 dated 22.12.2014 and quash the same as illegal and direct the respondents to produce the detenu namely Vijayan S/o.Rajendran aged 32 years now detained in Central Prison, Madurai before this Court and set him at liberty, forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Ramanatha Sethupathi

For Respondents : Mr.C.Ramesh

Addl.Public Prosecutor

ORDER


(Order of the Court was made by A.SELVAM, J.)

This Habeas Corpus Petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to call for records relating to the detention order passed in No.93/BCDFGISSSV/2014 dated 22.12.2014 by the detaining authority who has been arrayed as second respondent herein against the detenu by name Vijayan S/o.Rajendran and quash the same and thereby set him at liberty forthwith.

2. The Inspector of Police, Tallakulam (Crime) Police Station as sponsoring authority has submitted an affidavit to the detaining authority, wherein it is stated that the detenu has involved in the following adverse case:

(i)Crime No.1324 of 2014, C5, Karimedu (Crime) Police Station registered under Section 392 of the Indian Penal code.

(ii)Crime No.1104 of 2014, D1, Tallakulam (Crime) Police Station registered under Section 392 of the Indian Penal Code.



Further it is stated in the affidavit that on 05.11.2014 one Manikandan S/o.Karuppannan as complainant has given a complaint in Tallakulam Police Station against the detenu and the same has been registered in Crime No.1109 of 2014 under Sections 392 r/w 397 and 506(ii) of the Indian Penal Code and ultimately requested the detaining authority to invoke Act 14 of 1982 against the detenu.

3. The detaining authority after considering the averments made in the affidavit and other connected documents has derived subjective satisfaction to the effect that the detenu is a 'habitual offender' and ultimately branded him as 'goonda' by way of passing the impugned detention order and in order to quash the same, the present Habeas Corpus Petition has been filed by the detenu himself as petitioner.

4. On the side of the respondents counter has been filed, wherein it has been contended to the effect that all the averments made in the petition are false and ultimately prayed to dismiss the same.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has contended that on the side of the detenu two representations have been submitted and the same are not disposed of without delay and therefore, the detention order in question is liable to be quashed.

6. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor has contended that the representations submitted on the side of the detenu are duly disposed of without delay and therefore, the detention order in question does not call for any interference.

7. On the side of the respondents, a proforma has been submitted, wherein it has been clearly stated to the effect that with regard to first representation in between column Nos.7 to 9, 4 clear working days are available and in between column Nos.12 and 13, 11 clear working days are available and with regard to second representation in between column Nos.7 to 9, 4 clear working days are available and in between column Nos.12 and 13, 9 clear working days are available and no explanation has been given on the side of the respondents with regard to huge delay in disposing of the representations submitted on the side of the detenu and that itself would affect his rights guaranteed under Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India and therefore, the detention order in question is liable to be quashed.

8. In fine, this Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the detention order dated 22.12.2014 passed in No.93/BCDFGISSSV/2014 by the detaining authority/second respondent herein is quashed and the petitioner/detenu is ordered to be set at liberty forthwith, unless he is required to be incarcerated in any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(Crl.Side)

/True copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar



1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 9.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
O/o. Commissioner of Police,
Madurai City, Madurai.

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

4.The Joint Secretary to Government
Public (Law & Order)
Fort St., George, Chennai-9.

5.The Addl.Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

+1cc to MR.R.Ramanatha Sethupathi,ADVOCATE IN SR NO. 23757

H.C.P. (MD) No.13 of 2015
29.04.2015

rg.04.05.2015 3p.7c.