



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 20.06.2017

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE T.S.SIVAGNANAM

and

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.VELMURUGAN

H.C.P. (MD) No.659 of 2017

Yesuraj

... Petitioner

-vs-

1. The 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

Theni District, Theni

3. The Superintendent of Prison

Borstal School and District Jail

Pudukottai District

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the entire records, connected with the detention order No. in 27/2016/C3, passed by the second respondent, dated 22.11.2016 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu, by name, Robin, son of Yesuraj, aged about 19 years, detained in Borstal School and District Jail, Pudukottai before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Alagumani

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

O R D E R

[Order of the Court by T.S.SIVAGNANAM, J.]

The petitioner is the father of the detenu - Yesuraj, aged about 19 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order No.27/2016/C3, dated 22.11.2016, 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 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 22.11.2016. The petitioner made a representation on 09.12.2016. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 09.12.2016. The remarks were duly received on 29.12.2016. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 30.01.2017.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 20 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 07 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 13 days in submitting the remarks. Thereafter, there was another delay of 31 days in considering the representation, of which 12 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was another inordinate delay of 19 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.

WEB COPY

10. In the subject case, admittedly, there is an inordinate and unexplained delay of 13 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and 19 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 order No.27/2016/C3, passed by the second respondent, dated 22.11.2016, is set aside. The detenu, namely, Robin, son of Yesuraj, aged about 19 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-II)

/True copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To:

1. The 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,
Theni District, Theni.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Borstal School and District Jail,
Pudukottai District.
4. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law & order),
Fort Saint George, Chennai-9.
5. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

Krk/ia

AE/GT/SAR1/30.06.2017/3P/6C

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>

H.C.P. (MD) No.659 of 2017
20.06.2017