



HCP(MD)No.1421 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 25.06.2025

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA
and**

THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE R.POORNIMA

HABEAS CORPUS PETITION(MD)No.1421 of 2024

Perumalsamy

... Petitioner

vs.

1. The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai -9.

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

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

4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Dindigul District Jail,
Dindigul.

... 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 Detention Order No.90/2024, dated 19.09.2024 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu by name Perumalsamy, son of Sudalaimadan, aged



HCP(MD)No.1421 of 2024

about 34 years, now confirming at District Jail, Dindigul before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

WEB COPY

For Petitioner : Mr.S. Rameshkumar

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., Perumalsamy, son of Sudalaimadan, aged about 34 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Detention Order No.90/2024, dated 19.09.2024 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.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the date of hearing of the advisory board was fixed on 23.10.2024, whereas, the intimation about the date was served on the petitioner subsequent to the date




HCP(MD)No.1421 of 2024

fixed by the advisory board, and thereby sufficient time was not given to the detenu to inform his relatives well in advance 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 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



HCP(MD)No.1421 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 not 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."

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents would submit that the date of hearing before the Advisory Board fixed on 23.10.2024 has already been intimated to the petitioner / detenu through the Superintendent of Prison, Madurai and hence, the version of the petitioner is not sustainable and there was 2 days in between which was a



HCP(MD)No.1421 of 2024

reasonable and sufficient time and moreover, his relative had also made the

representation before the Advisory Board.

5. In this case, as pointed out by the learned counsel for the petitioner, intimation regarding the meeting of the advisory board on 23.10.2024 had been served on the detenu subsequent to the date of advisory board meeting fixed, whereas it is stated by the learned Additional Government Pleader that the intimation given to the detenu on 21.10.2024. 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 Detention Order No.90/2024, dated 19.09.2024, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Perumalsamy, son of Sudalaimadan, aged about 34 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.]
25.06.2025

Index : Yes / No
Neutral Citation : Yes / No
trp



HCP(MD)No.1421 of 2024

To:

WEB COPY

1. The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai -9.
2. The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector,
Dindigul District,
Dindigul.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Madurai Central Prison,
Madurai District.
4. The Superintendent of Prison,
Dindigul District Jail,
Dindigul.
5. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



HCP(MD)No.1421 of 2024

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

AND

R.POORNIMA, J.

trp

ORDER MADE IN
HCP(MD)No.1421 of 2024

DATED : 25.06.2025