

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 23.10.2017

Coram

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

H.C.P.No.1378 of 2017

Nithiya

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. By the Secretary,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Salem District.

...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 in C.M.P.No.45/Goonda/Salem City/2017, dated 06.07.2017 passed by the 2nd respondent under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondent to produce the petitioner's husband Santhosh, S/o.Ramakrishnana, aged about 28 years the detenu, now confined in Central Prison, Salem before this Court and set the petitioner's husband Santhosh, S/o.Ramakrishnan, aged about 28 years the detenu herein at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Gokula Krishnana

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 wife of the detenu, namely, Santhosh, S/o.Ramakrishnan, male, aged about 28 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in C.M.P.No.45/Goonda/Salem City/2017, dated 06.07.2017, 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 06.07.2017. The petitioner made a representation, dated 23.07.2017 and the same was received on 26.07.2017. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 27.07.2017. The remarks were duly received on 07.08.2017. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 16.08.2017.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 11 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 4 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 7 days in submitting the remarks. Thereafter, there was another delay of 9 days in considering the representation, of which 4 days were Government Holidays and hence, there was an inordinate delay of 5 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 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 7 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and 5 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 C.M.P.No.45/Goonda/Salem City/2017, dated 06.07.2017, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Santhosh, S/o.Ramakrishnan, male, 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.

(R.S.A., J.)

(N.S.K., J.)

23.10.2017

Index : yes/no

vsm

Note: Issue order copy today

सत्यमेव जयते
WEB COPY

RAJIV SHAKDER, J.
and

N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.

vsm

To

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

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Salem District.

3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Salem.

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

H.C.P.No.1378 of 2017



23.10.2017

WEB COPY