

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 18.01.2018

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.T.SELVAM

and

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

H.C.P.No.2288 of 2017

Dhanalakshmi ... Petitioner

-vs-

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

2.The District Collector & District Magistrate
O/o. The District Collector & District Magistrate,
Erode District. ... 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 Cr.MP.No.19/Goonda/2017 C1 dated 27.09.2017 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 husband Sandi @ Karuppusamy, son of Manickam, aged about 29 years the detenu, now confined in Central Prison, Coimbatore, before this Court and set the petitioner's husband Sandi @ Karuppusamy, son of Manickam, aged about 29 years the detenu herein, at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Gopikrishnan
For Respondents: Mr.V.M.R.Rajentran, APP

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu herein, viz., Sandi @ Karuppusamy, son of Manickam, aged about 29

years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Cr.MP.No.19/Goonda/2017 C1 dated 27.09.2017, 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.

2 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.

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 27.09.2017. The petitioner made a representation, dated 19.11.2017 and the same was received on 28.11.2017. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on the same day. The remarks were duly received on 07.12.2017. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 19.12.2017.

6 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 hence there was a delay of 7 days in submitting the remarks. Thereafter, there was yet another delay of 12 days in considering the representation, of which 4 days were Saturdays and Sundays, hence, there was another inordinate delay of 8 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 2288 (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.

10 In the subject case, admittedly, there is an inordinate and unexplained delay of 8 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and 7 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 Cr.MP.No.19/Goonda/2017 C1 dated 27.09.2017, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Sandi @ Karuppasamy, son of Manickam, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

/TRUE COPY/

SUB ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

To

- 1.The Secretary to Government, State of Tamil Nadu,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St George, Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Collector & District Magistrate
O/o. The District Collector & District Magistrate,
Erode District.
- 3.The Superintendent, Central Prison, Coimbatore.

4.The Joint Secretary to Government Public (Law & Order)
Fort Street George, Chennai-9.

5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

+1 CC to Mr.D.Gopikrishnan Advocate SR.NO.4196

H.C.P.No.2288/2017

KJI (CO)
VC (07/02/2018)



WEB COPY