



HCP(MD)No.86 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 20.07.2023

CORAM

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

H.C.P.(MD)No.86 of 2023

Muniyasamy @ Moorthy

.. Petitioner /
detenu

Vs.

1.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
Tirunelveli District, Tirunelveli

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

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the entire records connected with the detention order passed in M.H.S.Confdl. No.206/2022 dated 18.11.2022 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 Muniyasamy alias Moorthy aged about 27 years, S/o.Kanthasamy now



HCP(MD)No.86 of 2023

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

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

The petitioner is the detenu viz., Muniyasamy @ Moorthy aged about 27 years, S/o.Kanthasamy. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in M.H.S.Confdl. No.206/2022 dated 18.11.2022 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.

3. Though several grounds have been raised in the Habeas Corpus



HCP(MD)No.86 of 2023

Petition, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would mainly focus his argument on the ground that the detaining authority after being aware of the fact that there was no bail application filed by the detenu came to the conclusion that there is a real possibility of the detenu coming out on bail by relying upon the order passed in CrI.M.P.No.510/2021. The learned counsel therefore submitted that the similar case that was relied upon by the detaining authority was not a similar one to the effect that in the present case, there are previous cases, however, in the similar case that has been relied upon by the detaining authority, bail was granted to the accused therein on the ground that there was no bad antecedents and on that score, the detention order is liable to be interfered with.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor strongly opposed the Habeas Corpus Petition by filing his counter.

5. On carefully going through the detention order, the detaining authority was aware of the fact that no bail application was filed by the detenu. However, the detaining authority took into consideration the order passed in CrI.M.P.No.510/2021 dated 25.01.2021 and came to the



HCP(MD)No.86 of 2023

conclusion that there is a likelihood of the detenu coming out on bail.

Perusal of the order shows that the accused therein had been granted the relief of bail on the ground that there are no previous cases. However, in the present case, there are previous cases pending against the detenu and hence, the bail order that was relied upon by the detaining authority cannot be considered to be a similar one.

6. In view of the above, the detention order suffers from non application of mind and the same is liable to be interfered with by this Court. The impugned detention order is, therefore, liable to be quashed.

7. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in M.H.S.Confdl. No.206/2022 dated 18.11.2022 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Muniyasamy @ Moorthy, S/o.Kanthasamy aged about 27 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.)
20.07.2023

Internet : Yes
RR



HCP(MD)No.86 of 2023

To

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
State of Tamil Nadu
Fort St. George, Chennai-600 009.
2. The Joint Secretary to the Government
Public Law and Order
Fort St. George, Chennai 09.
3. The District Collector and District Magistrate
Tirunelveli District, Tirunelveli
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Palayamkottai
Tirunelveli.
5. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.86 of 2023

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

RR

H.C.P.(MD)No.86 of 2023

20.07.2023