



H.C.P(MD)No.636 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 27.07.2023

CORAM :

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

H.C.P(MD)No.636 of 2023

Bharath

.. Petitioner

vs.

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

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Madurai District.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Madurai Central Prison,
Madurai District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a writ of habeas corpus calling for the entire records connected with the detention order of the second respondent in BCDFGISSSV.No.01/2023 dated 11.01.2023 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu or body of the detenu namely Bharath, S/o.Rengarajan, aged



about 22 years, now detained as 'Goonda' at Madurai Central Prison before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Alagumani

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 detenu viz., Bharath, S/o.Rengarajan, aged about 22 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by order in BCDFGISSSV.No.01/2023, dated 11.01.2023, 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 14.11.2022, the detention order was passed only on 11.01.2023 i.e., after a considerable delay of nearly two months. Therefore, the detention order has to be set aside.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor strongly opposed this petition by filing counter.

5. As seen from the grounds of detention, it is clear that though the detenu was arrested on 14.11.2022, the order of detention came to be passed only on 11.01.2023 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 delay in passing the order of detention. Hence the impugned order of detention is liable to be set aside.



H.C.P(MD)No.636 of 2023

7. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in BCDFGISSSV.No.01/2023, dated 11.01.2023, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Bharath, S/o.Rengarajan, aged about 22 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.)

27.07.2023

NCC : Yes/No
Index : Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order

mbi



H.C.P(MD)No.636 of 2023

To

WEB COPY

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



WEB COPY



H.C.P(MD)No.636 of 2023

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

mbi

H.C.P(MD)No.636 of 2023

27.07.2023