



WEB COPY

HCP No. 2822 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 03-06-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

HCP No. 2822 of 2024

Kumari

Petitioner

Vs

1. The Secretary To The Government,
Home, Prohibition And Excise (XVI) Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.

2.District Magistrate And District Collector,
Tiruppur District, Tiruppur.

3.The Superintendent Of Police,
O/o. Superintendent Of Police,
Tiruppur District.

4.The Superintendent Of Prison,
Central Prison Coimbatore,
Coimbatore District.

5.The Inspector Of Police,
Udumalaipet Police Station,
Tiruppur.

**Respondents**

PRAYER : Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records connected with the detention Cr.M.P.No.90/Goonda/2024 dated 19.10.2024 on the file of the Respondent No.2 and quash the same and direct the Respondents to produce the person of petitioner husband one named Mr.Murugan Shivaguru S/o. Mayavan aged about 40 yrs now confined at Central Prison, Coimbatore before this Court and set him at Liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Muthamizhselvakumar

For Respondents : Mr.E.Raj Thilak,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

M.S.RAMESH, J.

AND

V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.

The petitioner herein, who is the wife of the detenu, Murugan Shivaguru, aged about 40 years, S/o.Mayavan, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 19.10.2024 slapped on her husband, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law Offenders,



Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand

Offenders, Sexual Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982

[Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

3. Though several grounds are raised in the petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner pointed out that the Detaining Authority has relied upon the stale cases and kept irrelevant FIR in Volume-I filed by them. Therefore, the learned counsel submitted that the document relied upon by the Detaining Authority to detain the detenu, has no live and proximate connection with the activities alleged to be prejudicial to maintenance of public order, and that there is no compelling necessity for detention. In support of his contentions, the learned counsel relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in '*Sama Aruna Vs. State of Telengana and others* reported in '(2018) 12 SCC 150'.



WEB COPY

4. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in *Sama Aruna's case (supra)*, has observed as follows :

“22. We are of the view, that the detention order in this case is vitiated by taking into account incidents so far back in the past as would have no bearing on the immediate need to detain him without a trial. The satisfaction of the authority is not in respect of the thing in regard to which it is required to be satisfied. Incidents which are stale, cease to have relevance to the subject matter of the enquiry and must be treated as extraneous to the scope and purpose of the statute.

23. In this case, we find the authority has come to a conclusion so unreasonable that no reasonable authority could ever reach. A detaining authority must be taken to know both, the purpose and the procedure of law. It is no answer to say that the authority was satisfied. In T.A. Abdul Rahman v. State of Kerala and Ors. [(1989) 4 SCC 741] , this Court observed, where the authority takes into account stale incidents which have gone by to seed it would be safe to infer that the satisfaction of the authority is not a genuine one.”

5. On perusal of the records particularly in page Nos.77 to 79 in Volume



WEB COPY

I, this Court finds that the Detaining Authority has relied upon the irrelevant FIR which has no material to indicate that the incident relied upon by the Detaining Authority to arrive at the substantive satisfaction to detain the detenu, has a live and proximate link with the activities of the detenu which is prejudicial to the maintenance of public order. As held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Sama Aruna's case (supra)*, incidents which are stale, cease to have relevance to the subject matter of the inquiry and must be treated as extraneous to the scope and purpose of the Statute. The incident relied upon by the Detaining Authority through the newspaper cutting is stale and does not indicate the immediate need to detain the detenu. The Detaining Authority has taken into account only stale incident and therefore, there is no compelling necessity to detain the detenu in the ground case without a trial.

6. In view of the ratio laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and in view of the aforesaid facts, this Court is of the view that the detention order is vitiated and the same is liable to be quashed.



7. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 19.10.2024 in Cr.M.P.No.90/Goonda/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas

WEB COPY

Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Murugan Shivaguru, aged 40 years, S/o.Mayavan, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless he is required in connection with any other case.

(M.S.RAMESH J.) (V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN J.)
03-06-2025

nl

Index:Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation:Yes/No



WEB COPY

HCP No. 2822 of 2



To

1.The Secretary To The Government,
Home, Prohibition And Excise (XVI) Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.

2.District Magistrate And District Collector,
Tiruppur District, Tiruppur.

3.The Superintendent Of Police,
O/o. Superintendent Of Police, Tiruppur District.

4.The Superintendent Of Prison,
Central Prison, Coimbatore, Coimbatore District.

5.The Inspector Of Police
Udumalaipet Police Station, Tiruppur District.



WEB COPY

HCP No. 2822 of 2



M.S.RAMESH J.
AND
V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN J.
nl



WEB COPY

HCP No. 2822 of 2



HCP No. 2822 of 2024

03-06-2025