

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 24.10.2017

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

H.C.P. No.1044 of 2017

Savithiri ... Petitioner
-vs-

1. The State of Tamil Nadu
Represented by its Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort. St. George, Chennai - 600 009
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Chennai Police,
Vepery, Chennai -7. ... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the entire records leading to the detention of the petitioner's daughter Nishanthi W/o.Lukka Suresh, Female aged about 24 years is presently lodged in Special Prison for Women Puzhal at Chennai and has been detained under Act 14/82 as a "Goonda" vide detention order dated 20.05.2017 on the file of the 2nd respondent herein, made in Memo No.282/BCDFGISSSV/2017 quash the same and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the body and person of the said detainee before this Court and thereafter set her at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Rajavelu

For Respondents : Mr. V.M.R.Rajendran
Additional Public Prosecutor

WEB COPY
O R D E R

[Order of the Court was made by N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.]

The petitioner is the mother of the detainee, namely, Nishanthi W/o.Lukka Suresh, Female aged about 24 years. The detainee has been detained by the 2nd respondent by his order in Memo No.282/BCDFGISSSV/2017, dated 20.05.2017, holding her to be a "Goonda", as contemplated under 2(f) of Tamil Nadu Act 14

of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this Habeas Corpus Petition.

2. We have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing 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 appearing 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 in time and there was an inordinate and unexplained delay with regard to the same.

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 detainee 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 20.05.2017. The petitioner made a representation, dated 24.05.2017 and the same was received on 26.05.2017. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on the same day, i.e., on 26.05.2017. The remarks were duly received on 05.06.2017. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 20.06.2017.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 10 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 4 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 6 days in submitting the remarks. Thereafter, there was another delay of 15 days in considering the representation, of which 4 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was another inordinate delay of 11 days in considering the representation.

7. In *Rekha vs. State of Tamil Nadu*, reported in 2011 (5) SCC 244, the Honourable 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 detainee.

8. In Sumaiya vs. The Secretary to Government, reported in 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, reported in 1980 (2) SCC 321, the Honourable 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 06 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and 11 days in considering the representation. The impugned detention order is, therefore, liable to be quashed.

11. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in Memo No.282/BCDFGISSSV/2017 dated 20.05.2017, passed by the 2nd respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Nishanthi, W/o.Lukka Suresh, Female aged about 24 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless her detention is required in connection with any other case. Given the nature of the case, this order will be communicated to the concerned Jail Superintendent by the Registrar General of this Court via Fax.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CCC)

//True Copy// सत्यमेव जयते

Sub Assistant Registrar

rkp/vsm

To:


1. The Secretary
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department (Home)
Fort. St.George, Chennai - 600 009

WEB COPY

2. The Commissioner of Police,
The Commissioner Office,
Vepery.
3. The Superintendent,
Special Prison for Women Puzhal,
Chennai
4. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court,
Madras.

H.C.P. No.1044 of 2017

VR(25/10/2017)



WEB COPY