

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS
DATED:15.02.2018

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.T.SELVAM

and

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

H.C.P.No.2378/2017

Banupriya

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St George, Chennai-9.

2.The District Magistrate & District Collector
Tiruppur District, Tiruppur. .. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the entire records relating to the petitioner's husband detention under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 vide detention order dated 30.10.2017 on the file of the 2nd respondent herein made in proceedings Memo Cr.MP.No.06/Goondas/2017, quash the same as illegal and consequently, direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's husband namely Karthik @ Karthikeyan, son of Periyasamy, aged 32 years before this Court and set the petitioner's husband at liberty from detention, now the petitioner's husband detained at Central Prison, Coimbatore.

For Petitioner : Mr.W.Camyles Gandhi
For Respondents : Mr.V.M.R.Rajentran, APP

ORDER

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

Challenge is made to the order of detention passed by the second respondent vide Proceedings in Cr.MP.No.6/Goondas/2017 dated 30.10.2017, whereby the detenu/the husband of the petitioner herein, by name, Karthik @ Karthikeyan, son of Periyasamy, date about 32 years, was ordered to be detained under the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Slum-grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 (Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982) branding her husband as a "GOONDA".

2. Though many grounds have been raised in the petition, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, confines her argument only in respect of non-application of mind on the part of the detaining authority in passing the order of detention.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the detenu was arrested in the ground case in Cr.No.698/2017 on 12.08.2017 itself and he has not moved any bail application as on the date of passing of the detention order ; whereas the detention order was passed on 30.10.2017, i.e. Nearly after a lapse of two and half months. This inordinate delay in passing of detention order would vitiate the same. In support of his contention, learned counsel for the petitioner placed reliance on the judgment of a Division Bench of this Court reported in 2005 MLJ (Cr1.) 752 (Ramesh v. District Collector and District Magistrate, Tiruchirapalli District and another).

4. Per contra, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that the order of detention has been passed on cogent and sufficient materials and the same cannot be interfered with at the instance of the petitioner. Therefore, he submits that the Habeas Corpus Petition does not merit any consideration and the same is liable to be dismissed.

5. We have heard the learned counsel for both sides with regard to the facts.

6. A perusal of the grounds of detention as well as the detention order passed by the detaining authority would show that the Detention Order was passed on 30.10.2017 ; but a perusal of the grounds of detention, in particular paragraph No.5, would show that the detenu has not moved any bail application in the ground case as on the date of passing of the detention order. Further, the detenu was arrested in the ground case as early as on 12.08.2017. This shows an inordinate delay of nearly 2 ½ months in passing the detention order. There is no explanation forthcoming on the side of the respondents for this inordinate delay in passing the detention order. Learned counsel for the petitioner has rightly placed reliance on the decision in Ramesh's case (cited supra) wherein this Court has held as follows:

"....3. It is brought to our notice by the learned Government advocate that the analyst report was received on 06.12.2014 and the doctor has issued certificate on 07.12.2014. Even in the counter affidavit filed by the first respondent, it is stated that the sponsoring authority has submitted his affidavit only on 15.01.2015. When the sponsoring authority is in possession of the analyst report and the doctor's report even on 06.12.2014 and 07.12.2014, there is no proper explanation for

submitting his affidavit till 15.01.2015 for invoking the provisions of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. Even thereafter, the impugned detention order was passed only on 27.02.2015, i.e. After five weeks of receipt of the affidavit from the sponsoring authority. Though the detaining authority has filed a counter affidavit, there is no explanation for the undue delay in passing the impugned order.

4.In this regard, learned counsel for the petitioner relied on unreported decision of this Court rendered in H.C.P. No.1149 of 1995, dated 13.12.1995. In similar circumstances, after pointing out the unexplained delay between the date of submission of the affidavit by the sponsoring authority and the detention order, the Division Bench of this Court has concluded thus:

"Such delays tend to have an affect of snapping the link between prejudicial activity and passing of preventive orders....."

7.In view of the above decision rendered by the Division Bench of this Court, this Court is of the view that the detention order is unsustainable in law on the ground of inordinate and unexplained delay in passing the detention order and the same is liable to be set aside.

8.Accordingly, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the impugned detention order is set aside. The detenu is directed to be released forthwith unless his presence is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CO)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

AP

To

1.The Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St George, Chennai-9.

2.The District Magistrate & District Collector
Tiruppur District, Tiruppur.


3.The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.

4.The Superintendent
Central Prison, Coimbatore.

5.The Joint Secretary to Govt.
(Law and Order),
Fort St. George, Chennai-9

SS(CO)
sm:6.3.2018

H.C.P.No.2378/2017



WEB COPY