

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 16.10.2020

Coram

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice M.M.SUNDRESH
and
The Hon'ble Mr. Justice D.KRISHNAKUMAR

H.C.P. No. 782 of 2020

A.Rajamani ... Petitioner/Wife of the
Detenue

-vs-

1. The Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Dept.,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Collector and
District Magistrate,
Namakkal District.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Namakkal District.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Salem.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Paramathi Police Station,
Namakkal District.

... Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the second respondent dated 26.02.2020 in CMP No. 10/Goondas/2020/M1 against the petitioner's husband Arumugam, male, aged 52 years, S/o.Kaliyannan, who is confined at Central Prison, Salem and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenue before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner .. Mr.S.Senthilvel

For Respondents.. Mr.R.Prathap Kumar,
Addl. Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by M.M.SUNDRESH, J.]

The petitioner is the wife of Arumugam, male, aged 52 years, S/o.Kaliyannan, who is the detenu. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in CMP No. 10/Goondas/2020/M1, dated 26.02.2020, holding him to be a "Goonda", as contemplated under Section 2(f) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this Habeas Corpus Petition.

2. We have heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents. We have also perused the records produced by the Detaining Authority.

3.Among other grounds, the detention order is mainly attacked on the ground that there is a delay in passing the order of detention. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner strongly contended that though the detenu was arrested on 09.01.2020, the detention order was passed only on 26.02.2020 i.e., after a considerable delay of nearly one month. Therefore, the detention order has to be set aside.

4.As seen from the grounds of detention, it is clear that though the detenu was arrested on 09.01.2020, the order of detention came to be passed only on 26.02.2020, and hence, there is an abnormal delay in passing the order of Detention, which caused prejudice to the interest of the detenu.

5.We have gone through the entire materials placed on record. There is no satisfactory explanation offered by the Detaining Authority for the delay in passing the order of detention. Hence the impugned order of detention is liable to be set aside.

6. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in CMP No. 10/Goondas/2020/M1, dated 26.02.2020, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Arumugam, male, aged 52 years, S/o.Kaliyannan, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1. The Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Dept.,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Collector and
District Magistrate,
Namakkal District.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Namakkal District.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Salem.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Paramathi Police Station,
Namakkal District
6. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.
7. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law & Order),
Fort St. George, Chennai-9

H.C.P.No.782 of 2020

sra(co)
rr ii (10/11/2020)

सत्यमेव जयते

WEB COPY