



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 25.11.2015

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.R.SHIVAKUMAR
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V.S.RAVI

H.C.P(MD)No.1170 of 2015

S.Radha : Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort.St.George, Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
O/o.The District Collector and
District Magistrate, Nagapattinam District, Nagapattinam.
- 3.The Superintendent of Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli. : Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the entire records in detention order passed in C.O.C.No.54 of 2015, dated 02.08.2015, on the file of the second respondent herein and set aside the same as illegal and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the petitioner's husband namely, K.Shankar, S/o.Kaliyamoorthy, Male, aged about 35 years, who is detained in Central Prison, Trichirappalli, before this Court and set him at liberty.


For Petitioner : Mr.K.A.S.Prabhu
For Respondents : Mr.A.Ramar,
Additional Public Prosecutor.

O R D E R

[Order of the Court was made by V.S.RAVI,J]

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu - K.Shankar, S/o.Kaliyamoorthy, Male, aged about 35 years. He has been detained, as per the order of the second respondent, dated 02.08.2015, under Section 2 (b) of the Tamilnadu Act 14 of 1982, branding him as "Boot-Legger". Challenging the same, she has come up with this Habeas Corpus Petition.

2.We have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the respondents. We have also perused the records carefully.



3. Though several grounds have been raised in the Habeas Corpus Petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner would mainly focus his argument on the ground that there is violation of procedural safeguards, which are guaranteed under Articles 21 and 22 of the Constitution of India. The learned counsel would submit that the representations made by the petitioner were not considered on time and there was an inordinate and unexplained delay. The learned counsel has relied on few Judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Based on the same, the learned counsel would plead for setting aside the detention order.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would, however, oppose this Habeas Corpus Petition. He would submit that though there was delay in considering the representations, on that score, the impugned detention order need not be interfered with, as on account of the said delay, no prejudice has been caused to the detenu and thus, there is no violation of the fundamental rights guaranteed under Articles 21 and 22 of the Constitution of India.

5. We have considered the above submissions.

6. In this case, the Detention Order was passed on 02.08.2015. As against the same, the petitioner made representations on 07.08.2015. The remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 12.08.2015. The remarks were received on 20.08.2015. Thereafter, the Government considered the issue and passed the order rejecting the representations on 31.08.2015. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was delay of six days respectively in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and there was delay of six days on the part of the Government in considering the representations.


7. Now, the question is as to whether on that score, the impugned order can be quashed.

8. In *Rekha Vs. State of Tamil Nadu*, [2011 (5) SCC 244], the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that the right to life and liberty of a person is protected, under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has further held that the procedural safeguards are required to be zealously watched and enforced by the Courts of law and their rigour cannot be allowed to be diluted on the basis of the nature of the alleged activities of the detenu.

9. In *Sumaiya Vs. The Secretary to Government*, [2007 (2) MWN (Cr.) 145], a Division Bench of this Court has held that the unexplained delay of three days in disposal of the representation made on behalf of the detenu would be sufficient to set aside the detention order.

10. In *Tara Chand Vs. State of Rajasthan and others*, [1980 (2) SCC 321], the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that any inordinate and unexplained delay on the part of the Government in considering the representation renders the detention illegal. This dictum has been followed in several Judgments consistently by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as this Court.

11. Applying the said dictum laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, if we look into the facts of the present case, undoubtedly, there



is an inordinate and unexplained delay of twelve working days in considering the above mentioned representations and therefore, the impugned detention order is liable to be quashed.

12. In the result, this Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and this Court sets aside the Order of Detention dated 02.08.2015, made in C.O.C.No.54 of 2015, by the second respondent, the District Collector and District Magistrate, Nagapattinam District, Nagapattinam, and directs the release of the detenu, by name K.Shankar, S/o.Kaliyamoorthy, Male, aged about 35 years, if his continued custody is not authorised in specific cases or by any other detention order.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (T&P)

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

NB

To

- 1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort.St.George, Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
O/o.The District Collector and
District Magistrate, Nagapattinam District, Nagapattinam.
- 3.The Superintendent of Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli.
4. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law and Order) Fort ST. George,
Chennai-9
- 5.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

GJM/GSV/PM/3.12.2015-3P-6C

Order Made in
H.C.P (MD) No.1170 of 2015
Dated: 25.11.2015