



HCP(MD)No.64 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 26.07.2023

CORAM

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

H.C.P.(MD)No.64 of 2023

S.Amuthavalli

.. Petitioner / Mother of
Detenu

Vs.

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

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Collectorate,
Thanjavur District, Thanjavur

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

.. Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records pertaining to the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent made in his proceedings in



HCP(MD)No.64 of 2023

P.D.No.170/2022, dated 30.12.2022, detaining the detenu namely Arun @ Sathiyaseelan, S/o.Marimuthu, aged 31 years, the son of the petitioner, referring to him under Section 2(f) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 as a Goonda and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu, who is detained in Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.I.Robert Chandrakumar

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 detenu viz., Arun @ Sathiyaseelan, S/o.Marimuthu, aged about 31 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in P.D.No.170/2022, dated 30.12.2022 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.64 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. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner strongly contended that though the detenu was arrested on 24.10.2022, the detention order was passed only on 30.12.2022 i.e., after a considerable delay of more than two 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 24.10.2022, the order of detention came to be passed only on 30.12.2022 and hence, there is an abnormal delay in passing the order of Detention, which caused prejudice to the interest of the detenu.



HCP(MD)No.64 of 2023


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 P.D.No.170/2022, dated 30.12.2022 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Arun @ Sathiyaseelan, S/o.Marimuthu, aged about 31 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.)
26.07.2023

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No

PNM/RR



1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.

2.The Joint Secretary
Public (Law and Order)
Secretariat, Chennai.

3.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Collectorate,
Thanjavur District, Thanjavur

4. The Superintendent of Prison, Central Prison, Trichy.

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



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.64 of 2023

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

PNM/RR

H.C.P.(MD)No.64 of 2023

26.07.2023