

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 14.12.2017

CORAM:

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

H.C.P.No.1693 of 2017

Hussan

... Petitioner

-vs-

1.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Villupuram District,
Villupuram.

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

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, directing the respondents herein to produce the detenu, "MASTHAN", S/o.Hussan, who is detained under Act 14/82 by the District Collector and District Magistrate, Villupuram District, Villupuram in his proceedings No.C2/23734/2017, dated 18.08.2017, who is now confined in the Central Prison, Cuddalore, before the Court and quash the same and set him at liberty forth with.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.N.Rajan

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 father of the detenu, namely, Thiru.Masthan, S/o.Usen, Male, aged about 32 years. The detenu has been detained by the 1st respondent by his order in No.C2/23734/2017, dated 18.08.2017 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 in time and there was an inordinate and unexplained delay with regard to the same.

4.Notice in this petition was issued on 12.09.2017, despite which, no counter affidavit has been filed by the State. However, 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 18.08.2017. The petitioner made a representation, dated 25.08.2017 and 06.09.2017 the same was received on 01.09.2017 and 07.09.2017. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on the same day, i.e., on 01.09.2017 and 07.09.2017. The remarks were duly received on 06.10.2017. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 11.10.2017.

6.It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 35 and 29 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 12 and 10 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 23 and 19 days in submitting the remarks. Thereafter, there was another delay of 5 and 5 days in considering the representation, of which 2 and 2 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was another delay of 3 and 3 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 unexplained delay of 23 and 19 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and 3 and 3 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 No.C2/23734/2017, dated 18.08.2017 passed by the 1st respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Thiru.Masthan, S/o.Usen, Male, aged about 32 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/-
Asst.Registrar (CS IV)

/true copy/

Sub Asst. Registrar

kas

To:

1.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Villupuram District,
Villupuram.

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

3.The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public, Law and Order Department,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Secretariat, Chennai - 9.

4.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Cuddalore.

5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court,
Madras.

H.C.P.No.1693 of 2017

kk(co)
nr 14/12/2017



WEB COPY