

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 26.02.2018

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.T.SELVAM
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

H.C.P.No.2264 of 2017

Tmt.Priya

... Petitioner

-Vs-

- 1.The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Egmore, Chennai.
- 2.The Secretary,
Government, of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Chief Secretariat, Fort St.George,
Chennai-600 009.
- 3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai.

.... 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 order of detention passed by the first respondent herein and made in No.628/B.C.D.F.G.I.S.S.S.V/2017 dated, 12/10/2017 and to set aside the same and directing the respondent to produce the detenu, the husband of the petitioner Thiru.Sridhar, aged 27 years, S/o.Dilli, who is presently confined in the Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai to be produced before this Hon'ble court and set at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.T.S.Srinivasan

For Respondents: Mr.V.M.R.Rajentran
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu herein, viz., Sridhar, son of Dilli, aged 27 years. The detenu has been detained by the first respondent by his order in B.C.D.F.G.I.S.S.S.V No.628/2017, dated 12.10.2017, holding him to be a

"DRUG OFFENDER", as contemplated under 2(e) 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.	Cr.No. & Police Station	Offences
1.	Cr.No.18/2017 NIB, CID Chennai	8(c) r/w 20(b)(ii) (A) of NDPS Act
2.	Cr.No.58/2017 NIB, CID, Chennai	8(c) r/w 20(b)(ii) (A) of NDPS Act

The ground case has been registered against the detenu in Cr.No.70/2017 on the file of Inspector of Police, N.I.B. CID, Chennai Unit for offences u/s 8(c) r/w 20(b)(ii)(B) of NDPS Act. The detention order has been passed by first respondent in BCDFGISSSV/628/2017 on 12.10.2017.

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 12.10.2017. The petitioner made a representation, dated 17.11.2017 and the same was received on 20.11.2017. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on the same day. The remarks were duly received on 29.11.2017. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 18.12.2017.

7. 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 2 days were Saturdays and

Sundays and Government holiday and hence there was an inordinate delay of 7 days in submitting the remarks. Thereafter, there was yet another delay of 18 days in considering the representation, of which 7 days were Saturdays and Sundays and Government holidays, hence, there was another inordinate delay of 11 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 7 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and 11 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.628/2017, dated 12.10.2017, passed by the first respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Sridhar, son of Dilli, aged about 27 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

WEB COPY
Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS-IX)
//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

kmi

To:

- 1.The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Egmore, Chennai.
- 2.The Secretary,
Government, of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Chief Secretariat, Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.
- 3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai.
4. The Joint Secretary to Government
Public law & order Secretariat Chennai-9.
- 5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras-104.

H.C.P.No.2264 of 2017

MG(CO)
EU(19/03/2018)



WEB COPY