



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 06.01.2016

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.R.SHIVAKUMAR

and

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V.S.RAVI

H.C.P (MD) No.1377 of 2015

Ranjitham

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu,
rep.by the Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.

2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Dindigul District, Dindigul.

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

.. 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 connected with the detention order passed in Detention Order No. 70/2015 dated 04-09-2015 on the file of the 2nd respondent herein and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's husband namely Mookaiah S/o.Rasu Thevar aged about 58 years now detained in Central Prison, Madurai before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Sudalaiyandi

For Respondents : Mr.A.Ramar,
Additional Public Prosecutor.

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu viz., Mookaiah S/o.Rasu Thevar. The detenu has been detained as per the order of the second respondent under Section 2(e) of the Tamilnadu Act 14 of 1982, branding him as "Drug Offender". Challenging the same, the present Habeas Corpus Petition has been filed.

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 representation made by the petitioner was 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 representation, 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 04.09.2015. As against the same, the petitioner made a representation on 11.09.2015. The remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 22.09.2015. The remarks were received on 29.09.2015. Thereafter, the Government considered the issue and passed the order rejecting the representation on 16.10.2015. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was delay of four days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and there was delay of nine days on the part of the Government in considering the same.

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/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 thirteen working days and therefore, the impugned detention order is liable to be quashed.

12. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and this Court sets aside the order of detention, dated 04.09.2015, made in Detention Order No.70/2015, by the second respondent / District Magistrate and District Collector, Dindigul District and directs the release of the detenu by name Mookaiah S/o.Rasu Thevar, aged about 58 years forthwith, if his continued custody/detention is not authorised in specific cases or by any other order of detention.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Government of Tamil Nadu
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
 - 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Dindigul District, Dindigul.
 - 3.The Superintendent of Central Prison,
Madurai, Madurai District.
 - 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.
- +1cc to Mr.K.Sudalaiyandi, Advocate Sr.No.659
mj
AA/SKS-RR/SAR-II/11.01.2016/3p-7c

H.C.P (MD) No.1377 of 2015
06.01.2016