IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 15.11.2017

CORAM:

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

H.C.P.No.1709 of 2017

Rani ... Petitioner

-vs-

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

2.The Commissioner of Police,
City Police Office,
Huzur Road, Coimbatore City,
Coimbatore - 18. ... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records in No.C.NO.52/G/IS/2017 dated 26.07.2017 on the file of the second respondent herein to set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu i.e. the body of R.Akilan, S/o.Rajan, Male, aged 21 years the detenu detained under Act 14 of 1982 in detention order No. C.NO.52/G/IS/2017 dated 26.07.2017 herein now confined in Central Prison, Coimbatore before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Purushothaman
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 Mother of the detenu, namely, R.Akilan, S/o.Rajan, Male, aged about 21 years. The detenu has been detained by the 2nd respondent by his order in C.NO.52/G/IS/2017, dated 26.07.2017, 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

WEB COPY
https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

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 26.07.2017. The petitioner made representations, dated nil and nil and the same was received on 31.08.2017 and 05.09.2017. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 31.08.2017 and 06.09.2017. The remarks were duly received on 11.09.2017 and 12.09.2017. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 03.10.2017 and 03.10.2017.

6.It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 10 days and 06 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 04 days and 02 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 06 days and 04 days in submitting the remarks. Thereafter, there was another delay of 14 days and 13 days in considering the representation, of which 04 days and 04 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was another inordinate delay of 10 days and 09 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.

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

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 06 days and 04 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and 10 days and 09 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.NO.52/G/IS/2017, dated 26.07.2017, passed by the 2nd respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, R.Akilan, S/o.Rajan, Male, aged about 21 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(CCC)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

pam

To:

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

2.The Commissioner of Police,
City Police Office,
Huzur Road, Coimbatore City,
Coimbatore - 18.

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

WEB COPY
https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

4.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Coimbatore.

5.The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court,
Madras.

H.C.P.No.1709 of 2017

GN(15/11/2017)

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/