

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 19.04.2017

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.NAGAMUTHU
and
THE HONOURABLE DR.JUSTICE ANITA SUMANTH

H.C.P.No. 2164 of 2016

M.G.Paulraj Petitioner

vs.

1. The District Collector and
District Magistrate,
Krishnagiri District,
Krishnagiri.
2. The Government of Tamilnadu,
Rep. By its Secretary,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Special Prison for Women,
Vellore. Respondents

Prayer : Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ of habeas corpus calling for the entire records connected with the detention order of the 1st respondent in S.C.No.14/2016 dated 18.08.2016 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body and person of petitioner's wife namely Karthikeyini, female, aged 43 years was detained as a 'Goonda' and lodged in Special Prison for Women, Vellore before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner .. Mr. S. Panneerselvan

For Respondents .. Mr. V.M.R. Rajentren,
Additional Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

(The order of the Court was made by S.NAGAMUTHU.,J)

This Habeas Corpus Petition has been filed by the husband of the detinue to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the

first respondent dated 18.08.2016 in S.C.No.14/2016 against the petitioner's wife Karthikeyini, W/o.Paulraj, female, aged 43 years and now she was confined at Special Prison for Women, Vellore and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the body of detainee before this Hon'ble Court and set her at liberty .

2. Even though the learned counsel for the petitioner raised many grounds in assailing the impugned order of detention in the petition, he confined his arguments only to the ground of delay in considering the representation of the detainee. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, the representation of the detainee, has been received by the Government on 15.09.2016 and remarks have been called for from the detaining authority on 15.09.2016. However, the remarks have been received by the Government only on 04.10.2016, after a delay of 19 days. He adds that the file was dealt with by the Minister concerned on 13.10.2016 and the rejection letter was communicated to the detainee on 14.10.2016. It is his further submission that as per the Proforma submitted by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, there were 18 intervening holidays and there is a delay of 09 days, which remains unexplained. The unexplained delay in considering the representation of the detainee vitiates the detention order. In support of his contention, the learned counsel for the petitioner relied on the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in Rajammal Vs. State of Tamil Nadu, reported in (1999) 1 SCC 417.

3. Resisting the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor had submitted that the impugned detention order has been passed on cogent and sufficient materials and there is no illegality or infirmity in the impugned order of detention. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor had further submitted that there was no deliberate delay on the part of the authorities concerned to consider and dispose of the representation of the detainee. It is contended that such a delay is not fatal to the impugned detention order, as the authorities concerned are dealing with the file right from the date of receipt of the representation and therefore, he prayed for dismissal of the petition.

4. We have considered the rival submissions carefully with regard to facts and citation and perused the materials available on record.

5. As per the Proforma submitted by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, the representation of the detainee was received by the Government on 15.09.2016 and remarks have been called for from the detaining authority on 15.09.2016. However, remarks have been received by the Government only on 04.10.2016,

i.e., after a delay of 19 days and the case of the detainee was dealt with by the Minister concerned on 13.10.2016 and the same was rejected on 13.10.2016. From the above, it is clear that in between 15.09.2016 and 04.10.2016, [i.e., the intermittent days between the remarks called for and the remarks received] there is a delay of 19 days. There were 18 intervening holidays, but still there is a delay of 09 days, which remain unexplained.

6. It is trite law that the representation should be very expeditiously considered and disposed of with a sense of urgency and without avoidable delay. Any unexplained delay in the disposal of the representation would be a breach of the constitutional imperative and it would render the continued detention impermissible and illegal. From the records produced, we find that no acceptable explanation has been offered for the delay of 09 days. Therefore, we have to hold that the delay has vitiated further detention of the detainee.

7. In the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Rajammal's case (cited supra), it has been held as follows:

"It is a constitutional obligation of the Government to consider the representation forwarded by the detainee without any delay. Though no period is prescribed by Article 22 of the Constitution for the decision to be taken on the representation, the words "as soon as may be" in clause (5) of Article 22 convey the message that the representation should be considered and disposed of at the earliest."

8. As per the dictum laid down by the Supreme Court in above cited Rajammal's case, number of days of delay is immaterial and what is to be considered is whether the delay caused has been properly explained by the authorities concerned. But, here 09 days delay has not been properly explained at all.

9. Further, in a recent decision in Ummu Sabeena vs. State of Kerala - 2011 STPL (Web) 999 SC, the Supreme Court has held that the history of personal liberty, as is well known, is a history of insistence on procedural safeguards. The expression 'as soon as may be', in Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India clearly shows the concern of the makers of the Constitution that the representation, made on behalf of the detainee, should be considered and disposed of with a sense of urgency and without any avoidable delay.

10. In the light of the above fact and law, we have no hesitation in quashing the order of detention on the ground of delay on the part of the Government in disposing of the representation of the detainee.

11. Accordingly, the habeas corpus petition is allowed and the detention order dated 18.08.2016, passed by the first respondent is quashed. The detainee is directed to be set at liberty, forthwith, unless his presence is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Asst.Registrar (J)

/true copy/

Sub Asst. Registrar

sr/sts

To

1. The District Collector and
District Magistrate,
Krishnagiri District,
Krishnagiri.
2. The Secretary,
Government of Tamilnadu,
Home Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Special Prison for Women,
Vellore.
4. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public(Law & Order),
Fort St.George, Chennai-9.
5. The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras.

br(co)
ss(9/5/2017)

H.C.P.No.2164 of 2016

WEB COPY