



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 25.07.2017

CORAM:

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

H.C.P.(MD) No.470 of 2017

Mariyammal

...Petitioner/Mother of Detenue

-vs-

1.The Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Tiruchirapalli City,
Tiruchirapalli.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Tiruchirappalli.

... Respondents


PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records pertaining to the impugned detention order passed by the 2nd respondent made in his proceedings in C.No.02/Detention/C.P.O./T.C/2017 dated 23.01.2017 in detaining the detenue under Section 2 (f) of the Tamilnadu Act 14 of 1982 as a GOONDA and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the Detenue namely Venthakkai Bala @ Balamurugan S/o.Subramani, Male, aged about 32 years, who is detained in Central Prison, Tiruchirapalli, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.M.Karunakaran
For Respondents : Mr.C.Ramesh,
Additional Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

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

<https://hcservices.eprints.org/hcservices/>
The Petitioner is the mother of the detenu, namely, Venthakkai Bala @ Balamurugan S/o.Subramani, Male, aged about 32 years. The



detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in C.No.02/Detention/C.P.O./T.C/2017 dated 23.01.2017, 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.

WEB COPY

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 23.01.2017. The petitioner made a representation, dated Nil and the same was received on 24.02.2017. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 24.02.2017. The remarks were duly received on 06.03.2017. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 10.03.2017.

6.It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 10 days in getting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 4 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 6 days in getting the remarks. Thereafter, there was another delay of 3 days in considering the representation, of which nil days were Government Holidays, hence, there was another inordinate delay of 3 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.

WEB COPY

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 6 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 order of detention in C.No.02/Detention/C.P.O./T.C/2017 dated 23.01.2017, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Venthakkai Bala @ Balamurugan S/o.Subramani, Male, aged about 32 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CSI)

/True Copy/

Sub-Assistant Registrar

To:

1. The Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Tiruchirapalli City, Tiruchirapalli.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli.
4. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law and Order) Department, Secretariat, Chennai-9
5. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai

gns/am

RL/6C/3P/KK/SAR4/1/8/2017

H.C.P. (MD) No.470 of 2017

25.07.2017