

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 28.04.2017

CORAM

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

H.C.P.No.2628 of 2016

Palaniyappan

.... Petitioner

vs.

1. State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by the Principal Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise (XVI) Dept.,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
O/o. the Commissioner of Police,
Salem City.
3. The Inspector of Police,
Shevapet Police Station,
Salem District.

..... 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 in C.M.P.No.87/Goonda/Salem City/2016 dated 18.11.2016 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body and person of the petitioner's son, named Bharath aged about 43 years, now confined at Salem Central Prison, before this Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner .. M/s.A.Raja Mohamed

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 father of the detenu to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the

records in connection with the order of detention passed by the second respondent dated 18.11.2016 in C.M.P.No.87/Goonda/Salem City/2016 against the petitioner's son namely Bharath, male, aged 43, S/o Palaniappan, who is now confined at Central Prison, Salem and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the body of detenu before this Hon'ble Court and set him 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 detenu. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, the representation of the detenu, has been received by the Government on 08.12.2016. He adds that the file was dealt with by the Deputy Secretary on 08.12.2016, while the same was dealt with by the Minister concerned on 22.12.2016, i.e., after a delay of 14 days. The rejection letter was communicated to the detenu on 23.12.2016. It is his further submission that as per the Proforma submitted by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, there were 05 intervening holidays and there is a delay of 09 days, which remains unexplained. The unexplained delay in considering the representation of the detenu 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 detenu. 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 detenu was received by the Government on 08.12.2016. The case of the detenu was dealt with by the Deputy Secretary on 08.12.2016, while the same was dealt with by the Minister concerned on 22.12.2016 with a delay of 14 days. From the above, it is clear that in between 08.12.2016 and 22.12.2016, [i.e., the intermittent days between

the case dealt by the Deputy Secretary and by the Minister concerned] there is a delay of 14 days. There were 05 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 detenu.

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 detenu 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 detenu, 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 detenu.

11. Accordingly, the habeas corpus petition is allowed and the detention order dated 18.11.2016, passed by the second respondent is quashed. The detenu is directed to be set at liberty, forthwith, unless his presence is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Asst.Registrar (CS II)

/true copy/

Sub Asst. Registrar

jbm/gsa

To

1. The Secretary to the Government of Tamilnadu,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Dept.,
Fort St George,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Salem City.
3. The Inspector of Police,
Shevapet Police Station,
Salem District.
4. The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Salem.
5. The Joint Secretary to Govt,
Public(Law & Order)
Fort Saint George,
Chennai-9
6. The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras.

+1cc to Mr.M/s.A.Raja Mohamed, Advocate in Sr.No.26182

MG(CO)
NR 15/06/2017

Order in
H.C.P.No.2628 of 2016