

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 8.3.2016

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.JAICHANDREN
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.NAGAMUTHU

H.C.P.No.2455 of 2015

Pushpa

..

Petitioner

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu
rep by the Secretary
Home Prohibition & Excise Department
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009
2. District Collector and District Magistrate
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate
Tiruvallur District .. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the records relating to the detention order in Memo No.34/BCDFGISSSV/2015 dated 8.9.2015 passed by the 2nd respondent under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondent to produce the petitioner's sister-in-law Mallika w/o.Masthan (late) aged about 39 years, the detenu now confined in Special Prison for women, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Court and set the petitioner 's sister-in-law Mallika w/o.Masthan (late) aged about 39 years, the detenu herein at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Gopi

For Respondents : Mr.A.N.Thambi Durai
Addl. Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

[Order of the Court was made by M.JAICHANDREN, J.]

This Habeas Corpus Petition has been filed by the sister-in-law of the detainee, namely, Mallika, aged 39 years, wife of Masthan (late) , to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records in Memo No.34/BCDFGISSSV/2015 dated 8.9.2015, passed by the 2nd respondent, detaining the detainee, under Section 3(1) of 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 14/1982), branding her as a "Goonda", and to quash the same and to direct the respondents to produce the body and person of the detainee and set her at liberty.

2. Even though the learned counsel for the petitioner raised many grounds in assailing the impugned order of detention in the petition, he confined his arguments only to the ground of delay in considering the representation of the detainee. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, the representation of the detainee, has been received by the Government on 15.10.2015 and remarks have been called for from the detaining authority on 15.10.2015. However, the remarks have been received by the Government only on 5.11.2015, after a delay of 21 days. He adds that the file was dealt with by the Minister concerned on 15.11.2015 and the rejection letter was communicated to the detainee on 18.11.2015. It is his further submission that as per the Proforma submitted by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, there were 9 intervening holidays and even after giving concession as to the intervening holidays, still there is a delay of 12 days, which remains unexplained. The unexplained delay in considering the representation of the detainee vitiates the detention order. In support of his contention, the learned counsel for the petitioner relied on the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in Rajammal Vs. State of Tamil Nadu, reported in (1999) 1 SCC 417.

3. Resisting the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor had submitted that the impugned detention order has been passed on cogent and sufficient materials and there is no illegality or infirmity in the impugned order of detention. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor had further submitted that there was no deliberate delay on the part of the authorities concerned to consider and dispose of the representation of the detainee. It is contended that such a delay is not fatal to the impugned

detention order, as the authorities concerned are dealing with the file right from the date of receipt of the representation and therefore, he prayed for dismissal of the petition.

4. We have considered the rival submissions carefully with regard to facts and citation and perused the materials available on record.

5. As per the Proforma submitted by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, the representation of the detainee was received by the Government on 15.10.2015 and remarks have been called for from the detaining authority on 15.10.2015. However, remarks have been received by the Government only on 5.11.2015, i.e., after a delay of 21 days and the case of the detainee was dealt with by the Minister concerned on 15.11.2015. From the above, it is clear that in between 15.10.2015 and 5.11.2015, [i.e., the intermittent days between the remarks called for and the remarks received] there is a delay of 21 days. Even if we give concession to the 9 intervening holidays including Government holidays, namely 17.10.2015, 18.10.2015, 21.10.2015, 22.10.2015, 23.10.2015, 24.10.2015, 25.10.2015, 31.10.2015 and 1.11.2015, still there is a delay of 12 days, which remain unexplained.

6. It is trite law that the representation should be very expeditiously considered and disposed of with a sense of urgency and without avoidable delay. Any unexplained delay in the disposal of the representation would be a breach of the constitutional imperative and it would render the continued detention impermissible and illegal. From the records produced, we find that no acceptable explanation has been offered for the delay of 12 days. Therefore, we have to hold that the delay has vitiated further detention of the detainee.

7. In the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Rajammal's case (cited supra), it has been held as follows:

"It is a constitutional obligation of the Government to consider the representation forwarded by the detenu without any delay. Though no period is prescribed by Article 22 of the Constitution for the decision to be taken on the representation, the words "as soon as may be" in clause (5) of Article 22 convey the message that the representation should be considered and disposed of at the earliest."

8. As per the dictum laid down by the Supreme Court in above cited Rajammal's case, number of days of delay is immaterial and what is to be considered is whether the delay caused has been

properly explained by the authorities concerned. But, here 12 days delay has not been properly explained at all.

9. Further, in a recent decision in Ummu Sabeena vs. State of Kerala - 2011 STPL (Web) 999 SC, the Supreme Court has held that the history of personal liberty, as is well known, is a history of insistence on procedural safeguards. The expression 'as soon as may be', in Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India clearly shows the concern of the makers of the Constitution that the representation, made on behalf of the detainee, should be considered and disposed of with a sense of urgency and without any avoidable delay.

10. In the light of the above fact and law, we have no hesitation in quashing the order of detention on the ground of delay on the part of the Government in disposing of the representation of the detenu.

11. Accordingly, the habeas corpus petition is allowed and the detention order dated 8.9.2015, passed by the 2nd respondent is quashed. The detainee is directed to be set at liberty, forthwith, unless her presence is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-
Asst.Registrar (AS)

/true copy/

Sub Asst. Registrar

To:

1. The Secretary
The State of Tamil Nadu
Home Prohibition & Excise Department
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009
2. District Collector and District Magistrate
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate
Tiruvallur District
3. The Superintendent
Special Prison for Women
Puzhal, Chennai


4. The Joint Secretary to Government
Public (Law and order) Department
Fort Saint George,
Chennai

5. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

6. The Commissioner of Police
Tiruvallur District

H.C.P.No.2455 of 2015

SV (CO)
kk 1/4



WEB COPY