



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
DATED: 24.04.2018
CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.T.SELVAM
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.M.BASHEER AHAMED

H.C.P(MD)No.256 of 2018

Raman @ Karuppasamy : Petitioner
Vs.

1. State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep by the Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort George Fort,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Thoothukudi District, Thoothukudi.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli.

: Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the entire records connected with the detention order passed in H.S. [M] confdl.No.02/2018, dated 15.02.2018, on the file of the second respondent herein and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu or body of the detenu, namely, Raman @ Karuppasamy, aged about 33 years, S/o.Samiya Thevar, now detained at Central Prison, Palayamkottai, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Pragalathan
For Respondents : Mr.V.Neelakandan
Additional Public Prosecutor.

O R D E R

[Order of the Court was made by C.T.SELVAM, J.]

The petitioner is the detenu - Raman @ Karuppasamy, aged about 33 years, S/o.Samiya Thevar. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent, by his order in H.S.[M] confdl.No.02/2018, dated 15.02.2018, holding him to be a "Goonda", as contemplated under Section of 2(f) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this Habeas Corpus Petition.



2. Though the order of detention has been assailed on several grounds, the learned counsel for the petitioner mainly relies on the contention that the representation made by the detenu for revocation of the order of detention was not considered within a reasonable time and such enormous delay in considering the representation amounts to denial of reasonable opportunity vitiating the order of detention.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that after the detention order is approved by the State Government, the Detaining Authority, which is other than the State Government, becomes functus officio and the rejection of the representation made by the petitioner on behalf of the detenu should have been made only by the State Government and not by the Detaining Authority. The representation made by the detenu, dated 15.02.2018, came to be rejected not by the State Government, but by the Detaining Authority, on 13.03.2018, nearly, three weeks after the Government approved the order of detention. On that ground also, the order of detention stands vitiated.

4. We also heard the submissions made by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor on the above said contentions raised on behalf of the petitioner.

5. As rightly contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the Detaining Authority, after the detention order was approved by the Government, ought to have transmitted the representation to the Government for the consideration of the Advisory Board and orders by the Government. The very fact that the Detaining Authority chose to pass an order of rejection after the detention order was approved by the Government, will show exercise of power, which is not conferred on the Detaining Authority. On that score alone, the order of detention is liable to be set aside.

6. In the result, the Detention Order, passed by the second respondent, in his proceedings in H.S.[M] confdl.No.02/2018, dated 15.02.2018, is quashed. The detenu, namely, Raman @ Karuppasamy, aged about 33 years, S/o.Samiya Thevar, is ordered to be set at liberty forthwith, if his detention is not required in connection with any other case.

7. In the upshot, we allow the Habeas Corpus Petition.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(Crl.Side)



To

1. The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort George Fort,
Chennai - 600 009.

2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Thoothukudi District, Thoothukudi.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli.
4. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law & Order),
Fort St. George, Chennai - 9
5. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

NB

JM/SV-MMS/SAR-III/17.05.2018/3P-6C

ORDER MADE IN
H.C.P(MD)No.256 of 2018
Dated: 24.04.2018