

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 23.07.2018

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE DR.JUSTICE S.VIMALA
AND
THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE R.HEMALATHA

Habeas Corpus Petition No.480 of 2018

Alamelu .. Petitioner
/ Mother of the detenu
Versus

- 1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by its Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Krishnagiri,
Krishnagiri District. .. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seeking for a Writ of Habeas Corpus, to call for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the second respondent dated 16.02.2018 in his office in S.C.No.10 of 2018 against the petitioner's son by name Thiru.Manogaran, S/o.Munusamy, aged about 23 years, now confined at Central Prison, Salem, Salem District and to set aside the same and to direct the respondents to produce the above said detenu before this Court and to set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.E.Kannadasan

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

O R D E R

(Order of the Court was made by S.Vimala, J.,)

The second respondent herein clamped an order of detention on 16.02.2018 as against the detenu, Manogaran S/o.Munusamy, aged 23 years, as the said authority arrived at the subjective satisfaction that the said detenu is a 'Bootlegger' and he has to be detained under the provisions of

the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 with a view to preventing him from acting prejudicial to the interest of public health and public order.

2. Challenging the order of detention, the mother of the detenu has come forward with the present Habeas Corpus Petition.

3. Heard Mr.E.Kannadasan, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Mr.R.Prathap Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

4. It is contended that there is a delay of 13 days in considering the representation and this has rendered the detention illegal.

4.1. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents submitted that there is a delay of 13 days only, in considering the representation and it in no way vitiates the order of detention.

4.2. Though such a contention is advanced, however, no explanation has been adduced by the respondents explaining the reasons for the delay.

5. In the case of Rashid Kapadia v. Medha Gadgil, (2012 (11) SCC 745), the Supreme Court had occasion to consider the effect of delay in considering the representation and in that context held as under :-

"13.It is well settled that the right of a person, who is preventively detained, to make a representation and have it considered by the authority concerned as expeditiously as possible, is a constitutional right under Article 22(5). Any unreasonable and unexplainable delay in considering the representation is held to be fatal to the continued detention of the detenu. The proposition is too well settled in a long line of decisions of this Court. We do not think it necessary to examine the authorities on this aspect, except to take note of a couple of judgments where the principle is discussed in detail. They are: Mohinuddin v. District Magistrate, Beed [(1987) 4 SCC 58 : 1987 SCC (Cri) 674] and Harshala Santosh Patil v. State of Maharashtra [(2006) 12 SCC 211 : (2007) 1 SCC (Cri) 680]."

6. In view of the above proposition, the delay in considering the representation submitted by the petitioner, which has not been explained properly, has vitiated the order of detention. The delay is fatal to the order of detention and this has rendered the detention illegal.

7. On this short ground, the order of detention is quashed. The habeas corpus petition is allowed. The detenu, Manogaran S/o.Munusamy, aged 23 years, is ordered to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his custody is otherwise required in any other case.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS V)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

ia/srk

To:

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Krishnagiri, Krishnagiri District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Salem.
- 4.The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law & Order),
Fort St. George, Chennai-9.
- 5.The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court,
Chennai - 104.

H.C.P.No.480 of 2018

rj[co]
srg 14/08/2018