

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 24.10.2017

Coram

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

H.C.P.No.916 of 2017

Valli

... Petitioner

Vs.

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

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Erode District,
Erode.

...Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records, relating to petitioner's friend detention under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 vide detention order, Dated 02.05.2017 on the file of the second respondent herein made in proceedings Cr.M.P.No.08/GOONDA/2017 C1 and quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the said petitioner's friend namely Muthuraj alias Muthu, Son of Selvaraj, aged 29 years before this Hon'ble High Court and set the petitioners friend at liberty from detention, now petitioner's friend detained at Central Prison, Coimbatore.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.C.Chellappan

For Respondents : Mr.V.M.R.Rajentran,

Adl. Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by **N.SATHISH KUMAR, J**)

The petitioner is the friend of the detenu, namely, Muthuraj @ Muthu, Son of Selvaraj, male, aged about 29 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Memo Cr.M.P.No.08/GOONDA/2017 C1 dated 02.05.2017, 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 02.05.2017. The petitioner made representations, dated 08.05.2017 & 18.05.2017 and the same were received on 15.05.2017 & 22.05.2017. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 15.05.2017 in respect of the first representation. Insofar as the second representation is concerned, remarks were called for on 22.05.2017. The remarks were duly received on 22.05.2017 in respect of the first representation. Insofar as the second representation, remarks were duly received on 29.05.2017. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representations on 15.06.2017.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that in respect of the first representation there was a delay of 7 days in submitting the

remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 4 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 3 days in submitting the remarks. Insofar as the second representation is concerned there was a delay of 7 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 2 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 5 days in submitting the remarks.

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 3 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority in respect of the first representation. Insofar as the second representation is concerned, there is an inordinate and unexplained delay of 5 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority. 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 Memo Cr.M.P.No.08/GOONDA/2017 C1 dated 02.05.2017, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Muthuraj @ Muthu, Son of Selvaraj, male, aged about 29 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.

WEB COPY

(R.S.A., J.)

(N.S.K., J.)

24.10.2017

Index : yes/no

nmm/vsm

Note: Issue order copy today

RAJIV SHAKDER, J.

and
N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.

nmm/vsm

To

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

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Erode District,
Erode.

3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Coimbatore.

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

H.C.P.No.916 of 2017

सत्यमेव जयते

WEB COPY

24.10.2017