

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 02.11.2017

CORAM:

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

H.C.P.No.1123 of 2017

Nasini Begum

... Petitioner

-vs-

1.The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep.by its Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai Police,
Vepery, Chennai 600007.

... 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, relating to the petitioner's husband detention under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 vide detention order, dated 31.05.2017 on the file for the second respondent herein made in proceedings BCDFGISSSV No.318/2017 and quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's husband namely Jamal son of Ragamathulla, aged 36 years before this Court and set the Petitioner's husband at liberty from detention, now Petitioner's husband detained at Central Prison-II, Puzhal, Chennai 600066.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.C.Chellappan
For Respondents : Mr. V.M.R.Rajentran
Additional Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

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

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu, namely, Jamal son of Ragamathulla, Male, aged 36 years. The detenu has been detained by the 2nd respondent by his order in BCDFGISSSV

No.318/2017, dated 31.05.2017, holding him to be a "Video Pirate", as contemplated under 2(j) 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 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 31.05.2017. The petitioner made representations, on 19.06.2017, 20.06.2017 and 18.09.2017 and the same were received on 21.06.2017, 04.07.2017, 20.09.2017 respectively. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 21.06.2017, 05.07.2017 and 20.09.2017. The remarks were duly received on 28.06.2017, 14.07.2017 and 27.09.2017. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representations on 03.07.2017, 18.07.2017 and 03.10.2017 respectively.

6.It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 3 days, 6 days and 4 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 3 days, 2 days and 2 days were Government Holidays and hence there was a delay of 3 days, 6 days and 4 days respectively, in submitting the remarks. Thereafter, there was another delay of 3 days in first two representations for consideration, of which 2 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was delay of 1 day each in considering the first two representations.

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.

1. 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.

2.

9. In Tara Chand vs. State of Anbazhagansthan 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 a delay of 3 days, 6 days and 4 days respectively in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and 1 day each 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 BCDFGISSV No.318/2017, dated 31.05.2017, passed by the 2nd respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Thiru. Jamal male aged 36 years Son of Ragamathulla, 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(CS IV)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar


ggs
To

1. The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.

2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Vepery, Chennai 600007.
3. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public, Law and Order Department,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Fort St. George, Chennai - 600 009.
4. The Superintendent, Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai-600066.
5. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.1123 of 2017

AR(IV)
VR(02/11/2017)



WEB COPY