

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: **29.11.2022**

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH
AND
THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE N. ANAND VENKATESH

H.C.P.(MD)No.884 of 2022

V.Sunitha

... Petitioner /Wife of the
Detenu

Vs.

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

...Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to
issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records connected with

the detention order passed in P.D.No.30 of 2022 dated 11.05.2022 on the file of the 2nd respondent herein and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu or body of the detenu namely the petitioner's husband ie., Vinu @ Kaalaivandi Vinu, aged about 45 years, S/o.Swamy, now detained at the Central Prison, Palayamkottai, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Pragalathan

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar

Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

M.S.RAMESH,J.

and

N. ANAND VENKATESH,J.

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu viz., Vinu @ Kaalaivandi Vinu, aged about 45 years, S/o.Swamy. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in P.D.No.30 of 2022 dated 11.05.2022 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. Though several grounds have been raised in the Habeas Corpus Petition, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would mainly focus his argument on the ground that there is gross violation of procedural safeguards, which would vitiate the detention. The learned counsel, by placing authorities, submitted that the representation made by the petitioner was not considered on time and there was an inordinate and unexplained delay.

4. Apart from the other grounds, the main ground that was urged by the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the detaining authority, after being aware of the fact that no bail application was filed by the detenu, came to a conclusion that there is a likelihood of the detenu being let out on bail, by taking into consideration the order passed in CrI.M.P.No.937 of 2022. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the order that was relied upon by the detaining authority is not a similar case.

5.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor, on instructions, submitted that the investigation has been completed and charge sheet has been filed on 16.06.2022 on time and the case is pending in S.C.No.139 of 2022 on the file of the learned Additional District Judge, Kulithalai, Kanniyakumari District and the case stands posted on 08.12.2022.

6.We have carefully went through the order passed in CrI.M.P.No.937 of 2022.

7.That was a case where the accused therein was ranked as A9 and he was granted bail on the ground that his very presence in the scene of crime was doubtful and that all the properties were already recovered and the accused therein had also suffered incarceration for sufficient period of time. In the present case, there are adverse cases against the detenu and the facts relied upon by the detaining authority cannot be considered to be a similar case and hence, the detention order clearly suffers from non application of mind. The impugned detention order is, therefore, liable to be quashed.

8.In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in P.D.No.30 of 2022 dated 11.05.2022 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Vinu @ Kaalaivandi Vinu, aged about 45 years, S/o.Swamy, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

(M.S.R.,J.) (N.A.V.,J.)
29.11.2022

Index : Yes/No

Internet : Yes

Ns

To:

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Kanniyakumari District,
Nagercoil.
- 3.The Superintendant of Prison,
Central Prison,
Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

HCP(MD)No.884 of 2022

M.S.RAMESH,J.

and

N. ANAND VENKATESH,J.

Ns

H.C.P.(MD)No.884 of 2022

29.11.2022