



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 24.07.2017

CORAM:

**THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.M.SUNDRESH
AND
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR**

H.C.P(MD)No.314 of 2017

Dhanasekar @ Dhanasekaran : Petitioner

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai-9.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
O/o. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Thanjavur District,
Thanjavur.
3. The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli,
Tiruchirappalli District. : Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the entire records, relating to the impugned order of detention made in P.D.No.07/2017, dated 01.02.2017 on the file of the District Collector and District Magistrate, Thanjavur District, Thanjavur, the 2nd respondent herein, branding the detainee by name Dhanasekar @ Dhanasekaran, aged about 35 years, S/o.Ayyanaasamy, as 'GOONDA' who is now confined in Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli and quash the impugned order of detention and set him at liberty by producing him before this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar

For Respondents : Mr.C.Ramesh
Additional Public Prosecutor.

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by **M.M.SUNDRESH, J**)

The petitioner is the detenu- Dhanasekar @ Dhanasekaran, S/o.Ayyanaasamy, aged about 35 years and detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his proceedings in P.D.No.07/2017, dated 01.02.2017, holding him to be a "GOONDA", as contemplated under Section 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 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 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 representation made by the petitioner was not considered on time and there was an inordinate and unexplained delay.

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 01.02.2017. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on_28.02.2017. The remarks were duly received on 07.03.2017. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the representation on 10.03.2017.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 5 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and thereafter, there was again a delay of 3 days in considering the representation.

7. In **Rekha Vs. State of Tamil Nadu, [2011 (5) SCC 244]**, the Hon'ble 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, [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.

WEB COPY

9. 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 very detention illegal.

10. In the subject case, admittedly, there is an inordinate and unexplained delay of 5 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and 3 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 Detention Order passed by the second respondent, in his proceedings in P.D.No.07/2017, dated 01.02.2017 is quashed. The detenu, namely, Dhanasekar @ Dhanasekaran, Son of Ayyanaasamy, aged about 35 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(Writs)

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1. The Secretary,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai-9.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Thanjavur District,
Thanjavur.
3. The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli,
Tiruchirappalli District.
4. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public Works (Law & Order),
Fort Saint George, Chennai-9.



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

+1 cc to Mr.A.Thiruvadi kumar , Advocate in SR.No. 67183

WEB COPY

rmi/myr

AE/JC/SAR2/31.07.2017/4P/7C

ORDER MADE IN
H.C.P (MD) No.314 of 2017
Dated:24.07.2017