

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 13.10.2017

CORAM:

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

H.C.P. No.1049 of 2017

Christna ... 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 Commissioner of Police
The Commissioner Office
Vepery, Chennai - 600 007. ... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating to the detention order Memo No.251/BCDFGISSSV/2017 dated 09.5.2017 passed by the 2nd respondent under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and to direct the respondent to produce the petitioner's husband THIRU.ANANDAN @ KALLARAI JOHN S/O.SEKAR, aged about 28 years, the detenu herein at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Muthukumar

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. SATISH KUMAR, J.]

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu, namely, THIRU.ANANDAN @ KALLARAI JOHN S/O.SEKAR, aged about 28 years. The detenu has been detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, as per the Order of the second respondent in Memo No.251/BCDFGISSSV/2017 dated 09.5.2017, holding him 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 on 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 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 09.05.2017. The petitioner made a representation, dated 07.06.2017 and the same was received on 09.06.2017. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 09.06.2017. The remarks were duly received on 16.06.2017. 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 6 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 4 days were Government Holidays and hence, there was a delay of 2 days in submitting the remarks.

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 detenu.

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 the subject case, admittedly, there is an unexplained delay of 2 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority. The impugned detention order is, therefore, liable to be quashed.

10. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in order Memo No.251/BCDFGISSSV/2017 dated 09.5.2017, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, THIRU.ANANDAN @ KALLARAI JOHN S/O.SEKAR, aged about 28 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his 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

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

To:

1. The Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police
The Commissioner Office
Vepery, Chennai - 600 007.
3. The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal.
4. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court, Madras.


(In duplicate communication to the detenu)

5.The Additional Public Prosecutor
Madras High Court Madras

6.The Joint Secretary to Govt
Law and order Fort st.George Chennai

H.C.P. No.1049 of 2017

aa13/10/2017



WEB COPY