



H.C.P.(MD) No.1379 of 2024

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 09.06.2025

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA
and
THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE R.POORNIMA**

H.C.P.(MD) No.1379 of 2024

Madhankumar

... Petitioner

-VS-

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

2.The Commissioner of Police
Office of the Commissioner,
Trichy

3. The Superintendent of Prison
Tiruchirapalli Central Prison
Tiruchirapalli

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the entire records connected with the detention order of the second respondent in C.No.94/Detention/C.P.O/T.C/2024 dated



H.C.P.(MD) No.1379 of 2024

WEB COM

12.08.2024 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu by name Madhankumar son of Ravichandran, aged about 24 years, now detained as 'GOONDA' at Trichy Central Prison before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith

For Petitioner : Dr.R.Alagumani
For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.]

The petitioner is the detenu viz., Madhankumar son of Ravichandran, aged about 24 years . The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in C.No.94/Detention/C.P.O/T.C/2024 dated 12.08.2024, 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.



H.C.P.(MD) No.1379 of 2024

WEB COPY

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that notice to appear before the Advisory Board on 20.09.2024 was served on the next day on 21.09.2024 and thereby sufficient time was not given to the detenu to inform his relatives well in advance and avail assistance for making an effective representation before the board, thereby the detention order is vitiated. In support of his contention, the learned counsel for the petitioner would rely on the order passed by this Court in H.C.P(MD)No.444 of 2014 **John vs. The State rep. by the Secretary to Government** and the relevant portions are extracted hereunder:-

"43. In the detention order, when the detenu was permitted to avail the assistance of his friend or relative, if he so desirous, at the time of personal hearing before the Advisory Board, provided that his friend or relative, is no an Advocate and that the detenu has to make his own arrangement to get his friend or relative to be present, at the time of personal hearing before the Advisory Board, it is desirable also to state that his case would be considered within three weeks from the date of detention, so that he can make his own arrangements within such time.

44. Instead of finding fault with the detenu, who had not represented before the Advisory Board that he was not given



H.C.P.(MD) No.1379 of 2024

WEB COPY

adequate time, considering the right conferred on him, we are of the humble view, it is for the competent authorities, to give sufficient time, between the date of intimation and the date scheduled for the meeting of the Advisory Board, so as to enable him to either discuss the matter with anyone through the Superintendent of Prisons. The detenu has to inform his friend or relative, the nature of accusation made against him, discuss with him, for which, adequate time has to be given. Opportunity given should be real and now ritualistic. It should be effective and not illusory. A mere ritual would be an empty formality and not an opportunity. It would be a pretence or make belief. Opportunity given also includes reasonable notice of hearing, to avail the assistance of a friend or relative.

46. Reverting back to the case on hand, though the Advisory Board had fixed the personal hearing on 12.05.2014 at 12.00 Noon, the detenu had been intimated only on 09.05.2014 at 13.50 hours, by the Additional Superintendent of Police, Central Prison, Madurai. As 09.05.2014 was a Friday and the ensuing days, 10.05.2014 and 11.05.2014 were Saturday and Sunday, we are of the view that the detenu was not given sufficient time to contract any of his friends or relatives to assist him, to put forth his case, before the Advisory Board."



H.C.P.(MD) No.1379 of 2024

WEB COPY

4. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents strongly opposed the habeas corpus petition by filing his counter. He would submit that though notice to appear before the Advisory Board on 20.09.2024 was served on the next day on 21.09.2024, on that score alone, it cannot be quashed. According to the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, no prejudice has been caused to the detenu and therefore prays for dismissal of the habeas corpus petition.

5. In this case, as pointed out by the learned counsel for the petitioner, intimation regarding the meeting of the advisory board on 20.09.2024 had been served on the detenu on 21.09.2024 and thereby he was not able to inform the same to his relatives, friends so as to avail their assistance. We find that the time given is not adequate and sufficient, thereby, the detention order stands vitiated. We, therefore, have no hesitation in quashing the impugned detention order.

6. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in C.No.94/Detention/C.P.O/T.C/2024 dated 12.08.2024, passed by



H.C.P.(MD) No.1379 of 2024

WEB COPY

the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Madhankumar son of Ravichandran, aged about 24 years , is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[A.D.J.C., J.] [R.P., J.]
09.06.2025

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
aav
To:

- 1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police
Office of the Commissioner,
Trichy
3. The Superintendent of Prison
Tiruchirapalli Central Prison
Tiruchirapalli
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD) No.1379 of 2024

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.
AND
R.POORNIMA, J.

aav

H.C.P.(MD) No.1379 of 2024

09.06.2025