

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 23.08.2018

CORAM
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.T.SELVAM
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR

H.C.P.No.710 of 2018

J.Rani

... Petitioner

-VS-

The State represented by its

1.The Secretary to Government (Home),
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Government of Tamilnadu,
Fort St.George,
Chennai - 600009.

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

... Respondents

Writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India filed praying for issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the records pertaining to the order dated 27.03.2018 passed by the second respondent in C.M.P.No.17/Goonda/C2/2018 and quash the same and produce the petitioner's son, the detenu, Aravind @ Machi Aravind, aged about 24 years, S/o.Jeeva before this Court and set him at liberty and the detenu, now confined at Central Prison, Salem.

For Petitioner : Dr.S.Manoharan

For Respondents : Mr.M.Mohamed Riyaz
Additional Public Prosecutor

WEB COPY
O R D E R

(The order of the Court was made by C.T.SELVAM, J)

Petitioner is the mother of the detenu Aravind @ Machi Aravind S/o.Jeeva, who has been branded as a "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and detained under order of the second respondent passed in C.M.P.No.17/GOONDA/C2/2018 dated 27.03.2018.

2. The detenu came to adverse notice in the following cases:-

Sl.No .	Police Station and Crime No.	Sections of Law
1.	Magudamchavadi Police Station, Salem District. Crime No.382 of 2017	379 IPC
2.	Mallur Police Station, Salem District. Crime No.367 of 2017	392 IPC
3.	Karumalaikoodal Police Station, Salem District. Crime No.203 of 2017	392 IPC
4.	Gobichettipalayam Police Station, Erode District. Crime No.866 of 2017	342, 395 and 397 IPC
5.	Thiruchengode Rural Police Station, Namakkal District. Crime No.636 of 2017	341, 392 r/w 397 IPC

The alleged ground case has been registered against the detenu in Crime No.311 of 2017 on the file of Panamarathupatti Police Station, for offences under Sections 341, 395 r/w 398 and 506 (ii) IPC. Aggrieved by the order of detention, the present writ petition has been filed.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that the detenu was arrested on 18.11.2017 in respect of the ground case and the order of detention came to be passed on 27.03.2018. A period of 4 months had lapsed between the date of arrest of the detenu and the sponsoring authority recommending his detention. Such long delay stands not explained and hence, the order of detention is liable to be set aside following the order of Division Bench of this Court in Ramesh v. District Collector and District Magistrate, Tiruchirapalli District and another [2005 MLJ (Crl.) 752].

4. We have heard learned Additional Public Prosecutor on the above submissions.

5. In the decision relied upon by learned counsel for petitioner in Ramesh's case (cited supra), this Court has held as follows:

.....3.It is brought to our notice by the learned Government advocate that the analyst report was received on 06.12.2014 and the doctor has issued certificate on 07.12.2014. Even in the counter affidavit filed by the first respondent, it is stated that the sponsoring authority has submitted his affidavit only on 15.01.2015. When the sponsoring authority is in possession of the analyst report and

the doctor's report even on 06.12.2014 and 07.12.2014, there is no proper explanation for submitting his affidavit till 15.01.2015 for invoking the provisions of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. Even thereafter, the impugned detention order was passed only on 27.02.2015, i.e. After five weeks of receipt of the affidavit from the sponsoring authority. Though the detaining authority has filed a counter affidavit, there is no explanation for the undue delay in passing the impugned order.

4.In this regard, learned counsel for the petitioner relied on unreported decision of this Court rendered in H.C.P. No.1149 of 1995, dated 13.12.1995. In similar circumstances, after pointing out the unexplained delay between the date of submission of the affidavit by the sponsoring authority and the detention order, the Division Bench of this Court has concluded thus:

"Such delays tend to have an affect of snapping the link between prejudicial activity and passing of preventive orders.....".'

Following the principle enunciated in the above said order of the Division Bench of this Court, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the impugned detention order passed by the second respondent, detaining the detenu Aravind @ Machi Aravind S/o.Jeeva in C.M.P.No.17/GOONDA/C2/2018 dated 27.03.2018 is quashed. The above named detenu is ordered to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his custody is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS IX)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

gm

To

1.The Secretary to Government (Home),
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Government of Tamilnadu,
Fort St.George,
Chennai - 600009.


2.The District Magistrate and District Colelctor,
Salem District, Salem.

- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison, Salem.
- 4.The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law and order),
Fort Saint George, Chennai - 9.
- 5.The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Chennai.

H.C.P.No.710 of 2018

RG (CO)

rrs 17/09/2018



WEB COPY