INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed



www.ijlra.com

ISSN: 2582-6433

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted, or distributed in any form or by any means, whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission of the Managing Editor of the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)*.

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles published in this journal are solely those of the respective authors. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, or the Publisher of IJLRA.

Although every reasonable effort has been made to ensure the accuracy, authenticity, and proper citation of the content published in this journal, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible, in any manner whatsoever, for any loss, damage, or consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the information contained in this publication.

The content published herein is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice or professional opinion.

Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis. All rights reserved.

ISSN: 2582-6433

ABOUT US

The *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)* (ISSN: 2582-6433) is a peer-reviewed, academic, online journal published on a monthly basis. The journal aims to provide a comprehensive and interactive platform for the publication of original and high-quality legal research.

IJLRA publishes Short Articles, Long Articles, Research Papers, Case Comments, Book Reviews, Essays, and interdisciplinary studies in the field of law and allied disciplines. The journal seeks to promote critical analysis and informed discourse on contemporary legal, social, and policy issues.

The primary objective of IJLRA is to enhance academic engagement and scholarly dialogue among law students, researchers, academicians, legal professionals, and members of the Bar and Bench. The journal endeavours to establish itself as a credible and widely cited academic publication through the publication of original, well-researched, and analytically sound contributions.

IJLRA welcomes submissions from all branches of law, provided the work is original, unpublished, and submitted in accordance with the prescribed submission guidelines. All manuscripts are subject to a rigorous peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis* aspires to contribute meaningfully to legal scholarship and the development of law as an instrument of justice and social progress.

ISSN: 2582-6433

PUBLICATION ETHICS, COPYRIGHT & AUTHOR RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENT

The *International Journal for Legal Research and Analysis (IJLRA)* is committed to upholding the highest standards of publication ethics and academic integrity. All manuscripts submitted to the journal must be original, unpublished, and free from plagiarism, data fabrication, falsification, or any form of unethical research or publication practice. Authors are solely responsible for the accuracy, originality, legality, and ethical compliance of their work and must ensure that all sources are properly cited and that necessary permissions for any third-party copyrighted material have been duly obtained prior to submission. Copyright in all published articles vests with IJLRA, unless otherwise expressly stated, and authors grant the journal the irrevocable right to publish, reproduce, distribute, and archive their work in print and electronic formats. The views and opinions expressed in the articles are those of the authors alone and do not reflect the views of the Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, or Publisher. IJLRA shall not be liable for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the content published. By submitting a manuscript, the author(s) agree to fully indemnify and hold harmless the journal, its Editor-in-Chief, Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, and Management against any claims, liabilities, or legal proceedings arising out of plagiarism, copyright infringement, defamation, breach of confidentiality, or violation of third-party rights. The journal reserves the absolute right to reject, withdraw, retract, or remove any manuscript or published article in case of ethical or legal violations, without incurring any liability.

ISSN: 2582-6433

GROUNDS FOR CHALLENGING DETENTION UNDER HABEAS CORPUS PETITIONS: A JURISPRUDENTIAL ANALYSIS IN THE INDIAN CONSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

AUTHORED BY – DHANUJA V. M.
Designation – LLM (Final year)
Department – Constitutional Law and Legal Order
Institution – The Tamil Nadu Dr. Ambedkar Law University

CO AUTHOR: VARSHA B
Designation: LLM final year student
Organisation: The Tamil Nadu Dr. Ambedkar Law University

ABSTRACT

This article scrutinises the foundational principles underpinning a writ petition intended to contest wrongful confinement or unlawful detention imposed by the detaining authority. The ultimate constitutional remedy for unlawful deprivation of personal liberty in India is the writ of habeas corpus; Articles 32 and 226 guarantee this remedy. It requires the authority to produce the detained person and test whether the detention is valid or void. This article addresses the grounds for challenging wrongful confinement and illegal detention orders passed by the detaining authority through a Habeas Corpus Petition. It distinguishes preventive detention challenged by a writ petition for private confinement from ordinary criminal detention under Article 22 of the Constitution, which guarantees mandatory safeguards and provides a scope to challenge judicial custody. By examining relevant provisions and judicial pronouncements, the article justifies writ as a potential remedy, and its effectiveness depends on its alignment with established grounds and an appreciation of its inherent limitations. This article emphasises how the judiciary harmonises the public order and national security with personal liberty.

Keywords: Wrongful confinement, Writ of habeas corpus, Illegal detention, Personal liberty, Supreme Court of India.

ISSN: 2582-6433

1. INTRODUCTION

Article 21 of the Constitution of India protects personal liberty as a fundamental right. It provides that no person may be deprived of life or personal liberty except according to a procedure established by law[1]. The main way to enforce this protection against unlawful detention is through a writ of habeas corpus. Literally meaning "you may have the body," the writ requires the person or authority holding someone in custody to bring the detainee before the court and explain the legal grounds for the detention. If no lawful basis is given, the court orders the detainee's immediate release.

Habeas corpus is available under Article 32 before the Supreme Court (to enforce fundamental rights) and under Article 226 before the High Courts (to enforce fundamental rights and for any other purpose).[2] The remedy is summary in nature, prioritised in listing, and places the burden of justifying the detention upon the detaining authority. This article systematically examines the grounds on which detention may be challenged through a habeas corpus petition, situating the discussion within constitutional provisions, statutory frameworks and judicial doctrine.

2. CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY FRAMEWORK

The constitutional foundation of the writ lies in Articles 32 and 226.[3] Article 22 provides specific safeguards against arbitrary arrest and detention. Clause (1) requires that an arrested person be informed of the grounds of arrest "as soon as may be" and be afforded the right to consult and be defended by a legal practitioner of his choice. Clause (2) requires production before the nearest magistrate within twenty-four hours of arrest (excluding journey time) and prohibits detention beyond that period without a magistrate's authority.[4]

Article 22(3)–(7) expressly contemplates preventive detention. While ordinary criminal process safeguards do not fully apply to preventive detention, the Constitution and statutes such as the National Security Act, 1980 impose independent procedural requirements: communication of grounds, opportunity to make a representation, and reference to an Advisory Board within prescribed timelines.[5]

The Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (now largely replaced by the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023) and special statutes further regulate arrest, remand and detention. The

[1] INDIA CONST. art. 21.
[2] INDIA CONST. art. 32; INDIA CONST. art. 226.
[3] Id.
[4] INDIA CONST. art. 22, cls. (1)–(2).
[5] INDIA CONST. art. 22, cls. (3)–(7); National Security Act, No. 65 of 1980, § 8 (India).

ISSN: 2582-6433

writ tests the legality of detention as it stands on the date the court considers it.

3. NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE WRIT

Habeas corpus is a writ of right but not a writ of course. The petitioner must establish a prima facie case of unlawful detention. The court does not examine the merits of any underlying criminal charge or the correctness of the detaining authority's subjective satisfaction in preventive detention cases; its inquiry is confined to the existence of legal authority and compliance with mandatory procedural requirements.

The writ lies against both State authorities and private persons. It has been invoked in cases of alleged illegal police custody, preventive detention under special laws, continued detention after lawful authority has expired, and private confinement (including matrimonial and familial disputes). Importantly, the writ is not a substitute for statutory remedies such as bail applications or appeals against conviction, nor is it available to secure the premature release of convicts serving lawful sentences.

4. PRINCIPAL GROUNDS FOR CHALLENGING DETENTION

4.1. Detention without Lawful Authority

The most fundamental ground is the absence of any legal basis for custody. Detention is unlawful if a person is held without a formal arrest in accordance with the law, if the authority to detain has expired (for example, after the maximum period of police custody or after bail is granted), or if custody continues after acquittal or completion of a sentence. In such cases, the court orders immediate release.

4.2. Non-Compliance with Mandatory Constitutional and Statutory Safeguards

- Failure to comply with the safeguards under Article 22(1) and 22(2) renders continued detention illegal. Key violations include:
- Failure to inform the arrested person of the grounds of arrest as soon as may be, preferably in writing and in a language understood by the arrestee.
- Failure to produce the person before a magistrate within twenty-four hours.
- Denial of the right to consult a legal practitioner
- Recent judicial pronouncements have emphasised that grounds of arrest must ordinarily be furnished in writing. Non-compliance may vitiate both the arrest and subsequent

ISSN: 2582-6433

remand, entitling the person to release.[6]

4.3. Challenges Specific to Preventive Detention

Preventive detention orders under statutes such as the National Security Act are frequently subjected to habeas corpus scrutiny. The courts examine whether:

- The grounds of detention were communicated within the prescribed period (ordinarily five days under the NSA, extendable to fifteen days in exceptional circumstances with reasons recorded).[7]
- The grounds and relied-upon documents were supplied in a language understood by the detenu, enabling an effective representation.
- The grounds are vague, irrelevant, stale, non-existent or extraneous to the statutory purpose.
- There has been non-application of mind by the detaining authority (for example, mere mechanical reproduction of the sponsoring authority's proposal).
- There has been unexplained delay in considering the detenu's representation.
- Statutory timelines for reference to and report by the Advisory Board have been observed.

Any of these defects is ordinarily sufficient to quash the detention order and direct release. The court does not sit in appeal over the detaining authority's subjective satisfaction, but insists that such satisfaction be based on relevant and proximate material and reached after genuine application of mind.

4.4. Limited Challenge to Judicial Remand Orders

Where a competent court has ordered remand, the scope of habeas corpus is narrowly circumscribed. The Supreme Court has held that a habeas corpus petition challenging a remand order is maintainable only if the remand is absolutely illegal, lacks jurisdiction, or was passed in an absolutely mechanical manner.[8] A reasoned remand order by a court of competent jurisdiction cannot ordinarily be questioned through habeas corpus; the appropriate remedy lies in the statutory forum.[9]

[6] See generally principles restated in recent Supreme Court decisions emphasising written communication of grounds of arrest.
[7] National Security Act, No. 65 of 1980, § 8 (India).
[8] Manubhai Ratilal Patel v. State of Gujarat, (2013) 1 SCC 314 (India); Gautam Navlakha v. Nat'l Investigation Agency, Crim. Appeal No. 510 of 2021 (India) (May 12, 2021) (holding that habeas corpus against remand lies only if the order is absolutely illegal, without jurisdiction, or passed in an absolutely mechanical manner).
[9] Serious Fraud Investigation Office v. Rahul Modi, (2019) 5 SCC 266 (India).

ISSN: 2582-6433

4.5 Private and Unlawful Confinement

The writ may be issued against private individuals who confine someone without lawful authority. Examples include relatives, spouses, or others confining an adult against their will, and the unlawful retention of a minor child. In child custody cases, the court may consider whether the custody is illegal or unauthorised. However, the child's welfare remains paramount, and ordinary guardianship proceedings under the Guardians and Wards Act are generally preferred unless the custody is clearly without authority of law.

4.6 Successive Petitions

A second habeas corpus petition against the same detention order is maintainable only if it is founded on fresh grounds that were not available or could not have been raised at the time of the earlier petition. Res judicata does not strictly apply to illegal detention, yet courts discourage repetitive petitions on identical or previously available grounds to prevent abuse of process and bench-hunting.[10]

5. JUDICIAL APPROACH AND LANDMARK PRINCIPLE

Indian courts have consistently characterised habeas corpus as a bulwark of personal liberty. The authority bears the burden of justifying detention, and the court examines the legality of custody as it exists on the date of return. Landmark principles emerging from the jurisprudence include:

- Strict compliance with procedural safeguards is non-negotiable.
- Subjective satisfaction in preventive detention must be real and based on relevant material.
- The writ does not lie against lawful judicial custody or against convicts seeking premature release under remission schemes; such matters fall within the domain of the executive under the relevant rules.
- The High Court under Article 226 is ordinarily the first forum; the Supreme Court under Article 32 may require explanation as to why the High Court was not approached.

These principles reflect a careful calibration between protecting liberty and preventing the writ from being converted into a parallel appellate or bail mechanism.

[10] Principles affirmed in successive High Court rulings, including decisions of the Madras High Court, consistent with the Supreme Court's approach that public policy does not bar a subsequent petition on genuinely fresh grounds.

ISSN: 2582-6433

6. LIMITATIONS OF THE REMEDY

Despite its potency, the writ has defined limits. It does not review the correctness of a detention order on merits where legal authority exists, and procedures have been followed. It cannot be used to secure bail in the face of a valid remand order or to obtain premature release of life convicts. Where statutory alternative remedies are available and efficacious, courts may decline interference. In cases of missing persons, the writ is available to secure production, but once the person appears and asserts free will (in the case of a major), the inquiry ordinarily concludes.

7. CONCLUSION

The grounds for challenging detention under a habeas corpus petition are firmly rooted in the constitutional commitment to personal liberty under Articles 21 and 22. Detention without lawful authority, non-compliance with mandatory safeguards, defects in preventive detention orders, and private confinement constitute the principal bases for successful challenge. Judicial doctrine has refined these grounds with precision, insisting on strict procedural fidelity while respecting the limited nature of the inquiry.

In an era of expanding preventive detention laws and complex criminal processes, the writ of habeas corpus remains an indispensable check against executive and private overreach. Its continued vitality depends upon vigilant invocation by litigants, rigorous scrutiny by courts, and a clear understanding of both its capacious protective scope and its carefully delineated boundaries. The remedy remains, in the classic phrase, the great and efficacious writ in all cases of illegal confinement.

REFERENCES

1. Constitution of India, Articles 21, 22, 32 and 226.
2. National Security Act, 1980.
3. Manubhai Ratilal Patel v. State of Gujarat, (2013) 1 SCC 314.
4. Decisions of the Supreme Court on remand orders and successive petitions (including principles restated in subsequent High Court rulings of the Madras and Kerala High Courts).
5. Leading authorities on preventive detention safeguards and non-application of mind.
6. Scholarly and practitioner analyses of habeas corpus procedure under Indian constitutional law.