



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
DATED: 22.12.2016
CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.SUBBIAH
and
THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE NISHA BANU

H.C.P (MD) No.787 of 2016

A.Veyilachi : Petitioner
Vs.

1.The District Collector cum District Magistrate,
Thoothukudi District, Thoothukudi.

2.The State, rep by,
The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort.St.George, Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.

3.The Inspector of Police,
Pasuvanthanai Police Station,
Thoothukudi 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 records in H.S.(M).Confdl.No.21/2016, dated 27.05.2016 and issue a writ, order or direction, more particularly, in the nature of Writ of Habeas Corpus or any other order or direction and set aside the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the detenu Apple @ Arumugavel, aged 35 years, S/o.Soodamani Thevar, who has been termed as "Goonda", now confined in Central Prison, Palayamkottai, before this Court and set the detenu at liberty.

For Petitioner

: Mr.G.Thalaimutharasu


For Respondents

: Mr.C.Mayil Vahana Rajendran
Additional Public Prosecutor.

O R D E R

[Order of the Court was made by R.SUBBIAH, J.]

This Habeas Corpus Petition is filed by the husband of the detenu - Apple @ Arumugavel, who is under detention, pursuant to the order passed by the first respondent dated 27.05.2016, in H.S.(M).Confdl.No.21/2016, under Section 2(f) 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 of 1982), read with



the order issued by the Government in G.O.(D).No.99, Home Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department, dated 18.04.2016, under Sub-Section (2) of Section 3 of the said Act, branding him as "Goonda".

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 produced by the Detaining Authority.

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 gross violation of procedural safeguards, which would vitiate the detention. The learned counsel, by placing authorities, submitted that the representation made by the petitioner was not considered on time and there was an inordinate and unexplained delay.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the Habeas Corpus Petition. He would submit that though there was delay in considering the representation, on that score alone, the impugned detention order cannot be quashed. According to the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, 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. The Detention Order in question was passed on 27.05.2016. The petitioner made a representation dated 07.06.2016. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 10.06.2016. The remarks were duly received on 14.07.2016. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the representation on 21.07.2016.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 11 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority.

7. In *Rekha Vs. State of Tamil Nadu*, [2011 (5) SCC 244], the Hon'ble Supreme Court has 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 undertaken by the detenu.

8. 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 order of detention.

9. In *Tara Chand Vs. State of Rajasthan and others*, [1980 (2) SCC 506], 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 very detention illegal.



10. In the subject case, admittedly, there is an inordinate and unexplained delay of 11 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority. The impugned detention order is, therefore, liable to be quashed.

WEB COPY

11. In the result, the Detention Order, passed by the first respondent, in his proceedings in H.S.(M).Confdl.No.21/2016, dated 27.05.2016, is quashed. The detenu, namely, Apple @ Arumugavel, aged 35 years, S/o.Soodamani Thevar, is ordered to be set at liberty forthwith, if he is not required for detention in connection with any other case.

12. In the upshot, we allow the Habeas Corpus Petition.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(RTI)

/True Copy/

Sub-Assistant Registrar

To

1.The District Collector cum District Magistrate,
Thoothukudi District, Thoothukudi.

2.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort.St.George, Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.

3.The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law and Order), Fort Saint George,
Chennai-9

4. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Palayamkottai

5.The Inspector of Police,
Pasuvanthanai Police Station,
Thoothukudi District.

6.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

NB

RL/7C/3P/SKN/MM/11.1.2017