

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 09.11.2018

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE Mr. JUSTICE C.T.SELVAM
AND
THE HONOURABLE Mrs. JUSTICE S.RAMATHILAGAM

H.C.P.No.1423 of 2018

Prathap

... Petitioner

-Vs-

1. State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Secretary, Home,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai - 600 009.

2. The Commissioner of Police,
The Greater Chennai City,
Vepery, Chennai-600 007.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records relating to the detention order in Memo No.377/BCDFGISSSV/2018 dated, 07/06/2018 passed by the 2nd respondent under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondent to produce the petitioner's father Chandru, S/O. Janakiraman Naidu, aged about 52 years, now confined in central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this Hon'ble court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Gopikrishnan

For Respondents : Mr.R.Prathap Kumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by C.T.SELVAM, J.]

The petitioner is the son of the detenu herein, viz. Chandru, Son of Janakiraman Naidu, aged about 52 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in BCDFGISSSV No.377/2018, dated 07.06.2018, 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. The detenu has come to adverse notice in the following cases:-

S.No.	Police Station & Crime No.	Section of Law
1.	S-13 Chromepet Police Station Crime No.61/2018	461, 380 IPC
2.	S-13 Chromepet Police Station Crime No.191/2018	380 IPC
3.	S-11 Tambaram Police Station Crime No.591/2018	379 IPC
4.	S-11 Tambaram Police Station Crime No.645/2018	379 IPC

The ground case has been registered against the detenu in Cr.No.648/2018 on the file of the Inspector of Police, S.11 Tambaram Police Station, for offences u/s 341, 294(b), 336, 427, 506(ii), 392, 397 IPC. The detention order has been passed by second respondent in BCDFGISSSV No.377/2018.

3. We have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents. We have also perused the records produced by the Detaining Authority.

4. 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.

5. 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.

6. The Detention Order in question was passed on 07.06.2018. The petitioner made a representation, dated 12.07.2018 and the same was received on 17.07.2018. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on the same day. The remarks were duly received on 19.07.2018. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and

passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 30.07.2018.

7. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was an inordinate delay of 2 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority. Thereafter, there was yet another delay of 10 days in considering the representation, of which 4 days were Saturdays and Sundays and hence there was yet another delay of 6 days in considering the representation.

8. 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.

9. 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.

10. 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.

11. In the subject case, admittedly, there is an inordinate and unexplained delay of 2 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and 6 days in considering the representation. The impugned detention order is, therefore, liable to be quashed.

12. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in BCDFGISSSV No.377/2018, dated 07.06.2018, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely Chandru, S/O. Janakiraman Naidu, aged about 52 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CO)

//True copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar


ksa-2/kmi

To:

1. The Secretary, Home,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
The Greater Chennai City,
Vepery, Chennai-600 007.
3. The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.
4. The Joint Secretary,
Public (Law and order) Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.
5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.1423 of 2018

MP (CO)
GMY (05/12/2018)



WEB COPY