



HCP(MD)No.1394 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 04.07.2023

CORAM

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

H.C.P.(MD)No.1394 of 2022

M.Kanaga

.. Petitioner /Wife of the Detenu

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu

Represented by the Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.

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

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

.. 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 passed in H.S.(M)Confdl.No.145 of 2022 dated



HCP(MD)No.1394 of 2022

21.07.2022 on the file of 2nd respondent herein and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu or body of the detenu namely the petitioner's husband i.e., Iyyappan, aged about 25 years, S/o.Muthusamy, now 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 wife of the detenu viz., Iyyappan, S/o.Muthusamy, aged about 25 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in H.S.(M)Confdl.No.145/2022 dated 21.07.2022 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.1394 of 2022

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 the learned counsel for the petitioner has raised several other grounds to assail the order of detention, he has mainly focused his argument on the ground that the copy of the initial remand order has not been furnished to the detenu, despite the same has been sought for by the petitioner in her representation. Therefore, on the sole ground, the detention order is liable to be quashed.

4. On consideration of the submissions made on either side and upon perusal of the documents available on record, especially, the representation made by the petitioner dated 18.08.2022, she had sought for the initial remand order, however, the same has not been furnished to the detenu, which vitiates the order of detention.



(M.S.R.,J.) (M.N.K.,J.)
04.07.2023

To

- <https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.1394 of 2022

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

Lm

H.C.P.(MD)No.1394 of 2022

04.07.2023