

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 30.10.2017

Coram

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDER
&
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR
H.C.P.No.1126 of 2017

Ekambaram

... Petitioner

Vs.

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

2.The District Collector and
District Magistrate of Vellore District
Vellore - 9.

...Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, call for the entire records, relating to the petitioner's son in law detention under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 vide detention order, dated 14.06.2017 on the file of the second respondent herein made in proceedings C3/D.O.No.55/2017 and quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the said petitioner's son in law namely Siranjeevi, Son of Manoharan, aged 24 years before this Court and set the petitioner's son in law at liberty from detention, now petitioner's son in law detained at Central Prison, Vellore.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.C.Chellappan

For Respondents : Mr.V.M.R.Rajentran,

Addl. Public Prosecutor.

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by **N.SATHISH KUMAR, J**)

The petitioner is the father-in-law of the detenu, namely, Siranjeevi, S/o.Manoharan, male, aged about 24 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in C3/D.O.No.55/2017 dated 14.06.2017, holding him to be a "Bootlegger", as contemplated under 2(b) 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 representations 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 14.06.2017. The petitioner made three representations, dated 21.06.2017, 22.06.2017 & 18.07.2017 and the same were received on 23.06.2017, dated Nil & 19.07.2017. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 23.06.2017, dated Nil & 19.07.2017. The remarks were duly received on 03.07.2017, 03.07.2017 and 03.08.2017. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 06.07.2017, 06.07.2017 & 22.08.2017.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 10 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority in respect of representations 1 and 2 are concerned, of which 5 days were Government Holidays and hence, there was an inordinate delay of 5 days in submitting the remarks. In so far as the third representation is concerned, there was a delay

days were Government Holidays and hence, there was an inordinate delay of 11 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 **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 5 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority in respect of representations 1 and 2 are concerned. Insofar as the third representation is concerned, 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.

11. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in C3/D.O.No.55/2017 dated 14.06.2017, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Siranjevi, S/o.Manoharan, male, aged about 24 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.

(R.S.A., J.)

(N.S.K., J.)

30.10.2017

Index : yes/no

vsm

Note: Issue order copy today

WEB COPY

RAJIV SHAKDER, J.

and

N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.

vsm

To

- 1.The Secretary to Government
Home Prohibition and Excise Department
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and
District Magistrate of Vellore District
Vellore - 9.
- 3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Vellore.
- 4.The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court,
Chennai.



H.C.P.No.1126 of 2017

WEB COPY

30.10.2017