



HCP(MD)No.969 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 17.08.2023

CORAM

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

H.C.P.(MD)No.969 of 2023

Arunpandian

.. Petitioner /Detenu

Vs.

1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Madurai City,
Madurai.

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

.. 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 of the Respondent No.2 in No.85/BCDFGISSSV/2022 dated 03.12.2022 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce



HCP(MD)No.969 of 2023

the body or person of the detenu by name Arunpandian, son of Maduraiveeran, aged about 29 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.Thiruvadikumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the detenu viz., Arunpandian, aged about 28 years, S/o.Maduraiveeran. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in No.85/BCDFGISSSV/2022 dated 03.12.2022 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.969 of 2023

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 28.08.2022, the detention order was passed only on 03.12.2022, i.e., after a considerable delay of more than three months. Therefore, the detention order has to be set aside.

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

5. As seen from the grounds of detention, it is clear that though the detenu was arrested on 28.08.2022, the order of detention came to be passed only on 03.12.2022 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 delay in passing the order of detention. Hence, the impugned order of detention is liable to be set aside.



HCP(MD)No.969 of 2023

WEB COPY

7. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in No.85/BCDFGISSSV/2022 dated 03.12.2022 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Arunpandian, S/o.Maduraiveeran, 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.)
17.08.2023

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Lm

To

1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Madurai City,
Madurai.

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



HCP(MD)No.969 of 2023

4.The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law and Order),
Fort St.George, Chennai.

5.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.969 of 2023

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

Lm

H.C.P.(MD)No.969 of 2023

17.08.2023