



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 11.08.2017

CORAM:

WEB COPY

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

H.C.P.(MD) No.597 of 2017

Ramesh

... Petitioner

-vs-

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

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tirunelveli District.

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 second respondent in M.H.S. Confdl No. 39/2017 dated 25.03.2017 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu by name Ramesh son of Chandrasekar, aged about 25 years, now confining at Palayamkottai Central Prison before this Honourable Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Alagumani

For Respondents : Mr.T.Mohan

Additional Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

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

The petitioner is the detenu, namely, Ramesh, Son of Chandrasekar, male, aged about 25 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in M.H.S.Confdl No. 39/2017 dated 25.03.2017, 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.

<https://hcservices.courts.mys.in/hcservices/>
The court has 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 25.03.2017. The petitioner made a representation, dated 19.04.2017 and the same was received on 24.04.2017. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 25.04.2017. The remarks were duly received on 11.05.2017. 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 16 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 5 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 11 days in submitting the remarks. Thereafter, there was another delay of 36 days in considering the representation, of which 10 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was another inordinate delay of 26 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 an 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 11 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and 26 days in considering the representation. The impugned detention order is, therefore, liable to be quashed.

WEB COPY

11. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in M.H.S. Confdl No. 39/2017 dated 25.03.2017, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Ramesh, Son of Chandrasekar, Male, aged about 25 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(Writs)

/True Copy/

Sub-Assistant Registrar

To:

- 1.The principal Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tirunelveli District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Palayamkottai Central Prison,
Tirunelveli District.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

Cp/akv

RL/5C/3P/KP/SAR1/23/8/2017

H.C.P.(MD) No.597 of 2017

11.08.2017