



H.C.P(MD)No.300 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 13.07.2023

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR

H.C.P(MD)No.300 of 2023

Veerasamy

.. Petitioner

vs.

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

2.The District Collector & District Magistrate,
Perambalur, Perambalur District.

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

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a writ of habeas corpus calling for the records pertaining to the impugned detention order passed by the second respondent in Cr.M.P.No. 35/2022 dated 29.09.2022 in detaining the detainee 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 detainee namely Bablu @ Sathiyamurthy,



H.C.P(MD)No.300 of 2023

S/o.Veerassamy, male, aged about 24 years, who is detained in Central Prison, Thiruchirappalli before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Joseph Jerry

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by M.S.RAMESH, J.]

The petitioner is the father of the detenu viz., Bablu @ Sathiyamurthy, S/o.Veerassamy, aged about 24 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by order in Cr.M.P.No.35/2022 dated 29.09.2022, 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.



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 11.08.2022, the detention order was passed only on 29.09.2022 i.e., after a considerable delay of nearly fifty days. Therefore, the detention order has to be set aside.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that on completion of investigation, charge sheet has been presented before the concerned Court and it is yet to be taken on file.

5. As seen from the grounds of detention, it is clear that though the detenu was arrested on 11.08.2022, the order of detention came to be passed only on 29.09.2022 and hence, there is an abnormal delay in passing the order of Detention, which caused prejudice to the interest of the detenu.

6. We have gone through the entire materials placed on record. There is no satisfactory explanation offered by the Detaining Authority for the



H.C.P(MD)No.300 of 2023

delay in passing the order of detention. Hence the impugned order of detention is liable to be set aside.

7. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in Cr.M.P.No.35/2022 dated 29.09.2022, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Bablu @ Sathiyamurthy, S/o.Veerassamy, aged about 24 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.)

13.07.2023

NCC : Yes/No

Index : Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

mbi



H.C.P(MD)No.300 of 2023

To

WEB COPY

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



WEB COPY



H.C.P(MD)No.300 of 2023

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

mbi

H.C.P(MD)No.300 of 2023

13.07.2023