



HCP(MD)No.47 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 11.07.2023

CORAM

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

H.C.P.(MD)No.47 of 2023

S.Anandaraj

.. Petitioner /Brother of the
Detenu

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu, represented by
The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
O/o. The Commissioner of Police,
Tiruchirappalli City,
Tiruchirappalli.

3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli.

.. Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to
issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records in
detention order passed in C.No.128/Detention/C.P.O/T.C/2022 dated



HCP(MD)No.47 of 2023

09.09.2022 on the file of the second respondent herein and set aside the same as illegal and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the petitioner's brother namely Vijay, S/o.Subramani, male, aged 25 years, who is detained in Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.A.S.Prabhu

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the brother of the detenu viz., Vijay, aged about 25 years, S/o.Subramani. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in C.No.128/Detention/C.P.O/T.C/2022 dated 09.09.2022 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.



HCP(MD)No.47 of 2023

WEB COPY

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 19.06.2022, the detention order was passed only on 09.09.2022, i.e., after a considerable delay of 82 days. 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 19.06.2022, the order of detention came to be passed only on 09.09.2022 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 delay in passing the order of detention. Hence the impugned order of detention is liable to be set aside.



HCP(MD)No.47 of 2023

6. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in C.No.128/Detention/C.P.O/T.C/2022 dated 09.09.2022 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Vijay, S/o.Subramani, aged about 25 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.)
11.07.2023

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Lm/mbi

To

1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
O/o. The Commissioner of Police,
Tiruchirappalli City,
Tiruchirappalli.

3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli.

4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

Page 4 of 5



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.47 of 2023

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

Lm/mbi

H.C.P.(MD)No.47 of 2023

11.07.2023