

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 22.12.2017

Coram

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDER
&
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR
H.C.P.No.1870 of 2017

G.Gowramma

... Petitioner

Vs.

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

2.The District Collector,
District Magistrate,
Krishnagiri District,
Krishnagiri.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records of the second respondent herein pertaining to the detention order made in S.C.No.61/2017 dated 27.09.2017 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body of the detenu Mr.C.Muniraj @ Billa son of Chenna Veerappa, aged about 28 years now detained in Central Prison, Salem, before this Hon'ble Court and set the detenu at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.P.Saravanan

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, Muniraj @ Billa, S/o. Chennaveerappa, male, aged about 28 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in S.C.No.61/2017 dated 27.09.2017, 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 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 27.09.2017. The petitioner made a representation, dated 07.10.2017 and the same was received on 10.10.2017. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 10.10.2017. The remarks were duly received on 09.11.2017. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 08.12.2017.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 30 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 9 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 21 days in

submitting the remarks. Thereafter, there was another delay of 29 days in considering the representation, of which 8 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 21 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 21 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and 21 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 S.C.No.61/2017 dated 27.09.2017, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Muniraj @ Billa, S/o. Chennaveerappa, 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.)

22.12.2017

Index : yes/no

vsm/vum

Note: Issue order copy today

WEB COPY

RAJIV SHAKDER, J.
and
N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.

vsm/vum

To

- 1.The State of Tamil Nadu rep.
by its Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department ,
Fort St, George,
Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector,
District Magistrate,
Krishnagiri District,
Krishnagiri.
- 3.The Joint Secretary
Public (Law and order) Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.
- 4.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Salem.
- 5.The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court,
Chennai.

WEB COPY

H.C.P.No.1870 of 2017

22.12.2017