

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 23.11.2017

Coram

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDER
&
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

H.C.P.No.1135 of 2017

T.Sudha ... Petitioner/wife of detenu

Vs.

- 1.The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by its Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St. George, Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate
Cuddalore District
Cuddalore ...Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records, in C3/D.O./31/2017 dated 08.06.2017 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondents to produce the petitioner's husband Thirumalai, S/o. Kannaiyan Chettiyar, aged about 41 years, who now detained in Central Prison, Cuddalore, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Gandhi Kumar
For Respondents : Mr.V.M.R.Rajentran
Addl. Public Prosecutor

सत्यमेव जयते

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, Thirumalai, S/o.Kannaiyan Chetiyar, male, aged about 41 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in C3/D.O./31/2017 dated 08.06.2017, holding him to be a "Goonda", as contemplated under Section 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 08.06.2017. The petitioner made representations, dated 27.06.2017, 23.06.2017 and the same was received on 30.06.2017 and 17.07.2017. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on the same days, i.e., on 30.06.2017 and 17.07.2017. The remarks were duly received on 26.07.2017 and 18.08.2017. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 23.08.2017 and 11.09.2017.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 26 and 32 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 8 and 10, days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 18 and 22 days in submitting the remarks. Thereafter, there was another delay of 28 and 24 days in considering the representation, of which 10 and 2 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was another inordinate delay of 18 and 22 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 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 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 an inordinate and unexplained delay of 18 and 22 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and 18 and 22 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 C3/D.O/31/2017, dated 08.06.2017, passed by the 2nd respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Thirumalai, S/o. Kannaiyan Chettyiyar, Male, aged about 41 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

kas/vsm

To

1. The Secretary to Government, State of Tamil Nadu
Home, Prohibition and Excise (XVI) Department
Fort St. George, Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.

2. The District Collector and District Magistrate
Cuddalore District
Cuddalore

3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Cuddalore.

(In duplicate for communication to the detenu)


4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court,
Chennai.

5. The Joint Secretary,
Public (Law & order) Department,
Secretariat, chennai 9

+1cc to Mr.K.GANDHI KUMAR Advocate, S.R.No. 83180

H.C.P.No.1135 of 2017

TR(23/11/2017)



WEB COPY