



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 21.12.2017

CORAM:

WEB COPY

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.SUBBIAH

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

H.C.P.(MD)No.1670 of 2017

Karuppusamy : Petitioner

Vs.

1.State of Tamilnadu represented by
the Principal Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 9.

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

3.The Inspector of Police
Dindigul Taluk Police Station,
Dindigul.

4.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Madurai.

: Respondents

PRAYER: Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issue of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the entire records pertaining to the order of detention passed by the 2nd respondent vide his order No.64/2017 dated 20.08.2017 and quash the same and consequently set the detenu namely, Maruthupandi, S/o.Karuppusamy, aged about 23 years, who is detained in Central Prison, Madurai at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Sasikumar

For Respondents : Mr.C.Ramesh

Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by R.SUBBIAH, J]

The petitioner is the father of the detenu viz., Maruthupandi, S/o.Karuppusamy, aged about 23 years. The detenu has been detained, as per the order of the second respondent, dated 20.08.2017, under Section 2(f) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982, branding him as "goonda". Challenging the same, the petitioner has come up with 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 carefully.

3. Though several grounds have been raised in the Habeas Corpus Petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner would mainly focus his argument on the ground that there is violation of procedural safeguards, which are guaranteed under Articles 21 and 22 of the Constitution of India. The learned counsel would submit that the representation made by the petitioner was not considered on time and there was an inordinate and unexplained delay. The learned counsel has relied on few Judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Based on the same, the learned counsel would plead for setting aside the detention order.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would, however, oppose this Habeas Corpus Petition. He would submit that though there was delay in considering the representation, on that score, the impugned detention order need not be interfered with, as on account of the said delay, 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. We have considered the above submissions.

6. In this case, the Detention Order was passed on 20.08.2017. As against the same, the petitioner made a representation dated 31.08.2017. The remarks were called for on 05.09.2017 and the remarks were received on 20.09.2017. Thereafter, the Government considered the issue and passed the order rejecting the representation on 03.10.2017. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 5 days in considering the representation by the Government.

7. Now, the question is as to whether on that score, the impugned order can be quashed.

8. In *Rekha Vs. State of Tamil Nadu*, [2011 (5) SCC 244], the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that the right to life and liberty of a person is protected, under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has further 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 of the detenu.

9. In *Sumaiya Vs. The Secretary to Government*, [2007 (2) MWN (Cr.) 145], a Division Bench of this Court has held that the delay of three days in disposal of the representation made on behalf of the detenu/detenu would be sufficient to set aside the detention order.



10. In Tara Chand Vs. State of Rajasthan and others, [1980 (2) SCC 321], the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that any inordinate and unexplained delay on the part of the Government in considering the representation renders the detention illegal. This dictum has been followed in several Judgments consistently by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as this Court.

11. Applying the said dictum laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, if we look into the facts of the present case, undoubtedly, there is an inordinate and unexplained delay of 5 working days and therefore, the impugned detention order is liable to be quashed.

12. In the result, this Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the impugned Detention Order, passed by the second respondent, in his proceedings in No.64/2017 dated 20.08.2017 is quashed. The detenu, namely Maruthupandi, son of Karuppusamy, aged about 23 years, is ordered to be set at liberty forthwith, if he is not required for detention in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS-III)

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1.The Principal Secretary to Government,State of Tamilnadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department, Fort St. George,
Chennai - 9.

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

3.The Inspector of Police, Dindigul Taluk Police Station,Dindigul.

4.The Superintendent of Prison, Central Prison, Madurai.
(In duplicate communicate to detenu)

5 The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law & Order) Department, Fort St.George, Chennai.

6.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

Order made in
H.C.P. (MD) No.1670 of 2017
Dated: 21.12.2017