



HCP(MD)No.89 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 21.07.2023

CORAM

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

H.C.P.(MD)No.89 of 2023

V.Poolpandi

.. Petitioner / Father of Detenu

Vs.

1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai – 600 009.

2.The District Collector cum District Magistrate,
Thoothukudi District,
Thoothukudi.

3.The Superintendent of Central Prison,
Palayamkottai Central Prison,
Tirunelveli District.

4.The Inspector of Police,
Kayathar Police Station,
Thoothukudi District.

.. 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 in H.S.(M) Confdl No.254/2022 dated 30.11.2022 on the



HCP(MD)No.89 of 2023

file of the respondent No.2 and quash the same as illegal and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the petitioner's son namely "Kalipandi @ Kali, S/o.Poolpandi" aged about 28 years now confined at Central Prison, Palayamkottai, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Sam Eugene Jebakumar
For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the father of the detenu viz., Kalipandi @ Kali, aged about 28 years, S/o.Poolpandi. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in H.S.(M) Confdl.No.254/2022 dated 30.11.2022 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.89 of 2023

3. Though several grounds have been raised in the Habeas Corpus Petition, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would mainly focus his arguments on the following grounds:

(i) The detaining authority has arrived at a subjective satisfaction that the accused Kalipandi @ Kali is trying to file a bail application before the appropriate Court in the ground case in Crime No.404/2022. However, in the materials supplied along with the order of detention, there are no materials available as to how the detaining authority has arrived at the subjective satisfaction that the detenu is taking steps to file bail application; and

(ii) The detaining authority has relied upon the order passed in CrI.O.P.(MD).No.23893/2016 dated 23.12.2016 and came to the conclusion that in a similar case bail has been granted and that there is likelihood of the detenu released on bail. The learned counsel for the petitioner therefore submitted that the order relied upon by the detaining authority is not similar and there is non application of mind on the part of the detaining authority.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor has not filed his counter. However, he strongly opposed the Habeas Corpus Petition. It is further



HCP(MD)No.89 of 2023

submitted that investigation has been completed in this case and final report has been filed in S.C.No.86/2023 and the same is pending before the II Additional District Court, Thoothukudi.

5. While arriving at a subjective satisfaction, the detaining authority has stated that the detenu is trying to file a bail application. However, in the materials supplied, there are no materials whatsoever to arrive at a subjective satisfaction that the detenu is taking steps to file a bail application. It is also seen that in the order that was relied upon by the detaining authority in CrI.O.P.(MD).No.23893/2016 dated 23.12.2016, the accused therein was enlarged on bail for the offences under Sections 294(b), 302 and 506(ii) IPC. However, in the present case, the offence involved is under Section 302 IPC. Hence, the order that was relied upon by the detaining authority cannot be considered to be an order passed in a similar case. On these grounds, the order of detention is liable to be interfered with.

6. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in H.S.(M) Confdl.No.254/2022 dated 30.11.2022 passed by



HCP(MD)No.89 of 2023

the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Kalipandi @ Kali, S/o.Poolpandi, aged about 28 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.)
21.07.2023

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

To

- 1.The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector cum District Magistrate,
Thoothukudi District,
Thoothukudi.
- 3.The Superintendent of Central Prison,
Palayamkottai Central Prison,
Tirunelveli District.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
Kayathar Police Station,
Thoothukudi District.
- 5.The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law and Order),
Fort St.George, Chennai.
- 6.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.89 of 2023

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

Lm/mbi

H.C.P.(MD)No.89 of 2023

21.07.2023