



HCP(MD)No.9 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 24.07.2023

CORAM

**THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH
AND
THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR**

H.C.P.(MD)No.9 of 2023

Pootchiammal

.. Petitioner / Mother of the Detenu

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by its Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.

2.The District Magistrate / District Collector,
O/o. District Collector,
Madurai District,
Madurai.

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

.. Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records connection with the detention order in B.C.D.F.G.I.S.S.V.No.88/2022, dated 06.12.2022 on the



HCP(MD)No.9 of 2023

file of the 2nd respondent on the petitioner's son namely Kannan (22/23), Son of Chelladurai, Karuppu Kovil Street, Vayalur, Madurai North Taluk, Madurai District has been detained and branded as “Goonda” under Section 3(1) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and confined at Central Prison, Madurai to set aside the same and to produce him before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Maran

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by M.S.RAMESH,J.)

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu viz., Kannan, S/o.Chelladurai, aged about 22 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in B.C.D.F.G.I.S.S.S.V.No.88/2022, dated 06.12.2022, 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.



HCP(MD)No.9 of 2023

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. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner strongly contended that though the detenu was arrested on 19.09.2022, the detention order was passed only on 06.12.2022 i.e., after a considerable delay of nearly three months. 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 19.09.2022, the order of detention came to be passed only on 06.12.2022 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



HCP(MD)No.9 of 2023

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 B.C.D.F.G.I.S.S.S.V.No.88/2022, dated 06.12.2022, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Kannan, S/o.Chelladurai, aged about 22 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

(M.S.R.,J.) (M.N.K.,J.)
24.07.2023

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No

vsm



HCP(MD)No.9 of 2023

WEB COPY

To

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Magistrate / District Collector,
O/o. District Collector,
Madurai District,
Madurai.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Madurai.
4. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.9 of 2023

M.S.RAMESH,J.
and
M.NIRMAL KUMAR,J.

vsm

H.C.P.(MD)No.9 of 2023

24.07.2023