



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 08.08.2017

CORAM:

WEB COPY

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.M.SUNDRESH
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

H.C.P.(MD) No.461 of 2017

Subramani

... Petitioner

-vs-

1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Fort.St.George, Chennai - 600 009.

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

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Palayamkottai Central Prison,
Tirunelveli District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records, connected with the detention order of the Respondent No.2 in H.S.(M).Confdl.No.21/17, dated 24.03.2017 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detene by name Subburaj, son of Karuppasamy, aged about 26 years, now detained in Palayamkottai Central Prison before this Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Vinoth Bharathi

For Respondents : Mr.C.Ramesh

Additional Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

[Order of the Court was made by M.M.SUNDRESH, J.]

The petitioner is brother of the detenu, namely, Subburaj, son of Karuppasamy, male, aged about 26 years. The detenu has been
https://hservices.punjab.gov.in/hservices/detained by the second respondent by his order in H.S.(M).
Confdl.No.21/17, dated 24.03.2017, 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 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 24.03.2017. The petitioner made a representation, dated Nil and the same was received on 24.04.2017. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 24.04.2017. The remarks were duly received on 08.05.2017. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 16.06.2017.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 9 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 5 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 4 days in submitting the remarks. Thereafter, there was another delay of 37 days in considering the representation, of which 10 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was another inordinate delay of 27 days in considering the representation.

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 4 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and 27 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 order of detention in H.S.(M).Confdl.No.21/17, dated 24.03.2017, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely Subburaj, son of Karuppasamy, Male, aged about 26 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(Records)

/True Copy/

Sub-Assistant Registrar

To:

- 1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Fort.St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Thoothukudi District.
Thoothukudi.
- 3.The Joint Secretary to Government of Tamil Nadu,
Public (Law and Order) , Fort Saint George, Chennai-600 009
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Palayamkottai Central Prison,
Tirunelveli District.

Ls/am

RL/5C/3P/KK/SAR2/18/8/2017

H.C.P. (MD) No.461 of 2017