

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 20.09.2018

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.T.SELVAM
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR

H.C.P.No.970 of 2018

Saran @ Saranraj
S/o.Sankar

... Petitioner

vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu
represented by
The Secretary to Government,
Department of Home, Prohibition and Excise,
Secretariat, Fort St.George,
Chennai.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Office of Commissioner of Police,
Vepery, Chennai - 7.

.... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records in Memo No.210/BCDFGISSSV/2018 passed by the second respondent on 10.04.2018, set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu Saran @ Saranraj S/o.Sankar, aged about 31 years, presently confined at Central Prison, Puzhal II, Chennai, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Elumalai

For Respondents : Mr.M.Mohamed Riyaz

Additional Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

(Order of the Court was made by C.T.SELVAM, J)

Petitioner, who is the detenu, has been branded as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and detained under orders of second respondent passed in No.210/BCDFGISSSV/2018 dated 10.04.2018. Such order is under challenge herein.

2. The detenu came to adverse notice in Crime No.1047/2017 on the file of P5 MKB Nagar Police Station for offences u/s.147, 148, 341, 302, 506(ii) r/w 120(B) IPC. The alleged ground case has been registered against the detenu in Crime No.147 of 2018 on the file of M1 Madhavaram Police Station, for offences u/s.341, 294(b), 336, 427, 392 r/w 397 and 506(ii) IPC.

3. We have heard learned counsel for petitioner and learned Additional Public Prosecutor for respondents. Perused the materials on record.

4. Though several grounds have been raised in the Habeas Corpus Petition, learned counsel for 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. In support of his contention, learned counsel for petitioner relied on the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in Rajammal vs. State of Tamil Nadu, [(1999) 1 SCC 417].

5. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that though there was delay in considering the representation, on that score alone, the impugned detention order cannot be quashed. According to 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 10.04.2018. The petitioner submitted a representation dated 09.05.2018 and the same was received on 09.05.2018. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on the same day. The remarks were duly received on 14.05.2018. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 01.06.2018 and sent to the detenu on 04.06.2018.

7. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was an inordinate delay of 4 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority. Thereafter, there was yet another delay of 16 days, of which 4 days were Government holidays and hence, there was yet another delay of 12 days in considering the representations.

8. In the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Rajammal's case (cited supra), it has been held as follows:

'It is a constitutional obligation of the

Government to consider the representation forwarded by the detenu without any delay. Though no period is prescribed by Article 22 of the Constitution for the decision to be taken on the representation, the words "as soon as may be " in clause (5) of Article 22 convey the message that the representation should be considered and disposed of at the earliest.'

9. As per the dictum laid down by the Supreme Court in above cited Rajammal's case, number of days of delay is immaterial and what is to be considered is whether the delay caused has been properly explained by the authorities concerned. But, here 16 days delay has not been properly explained at all.

10. Further, in a recent decision in Ummu Sabeena vs. State of Kerala [2011 STPL (Web) 999 SC], the Supreme Court has held that the history of personal liberty, as is well known, is a history of insistence on procedural safeguards. The expression 'as soon as may be', in Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India clearly shows the concern of the makers of the Constitution that the representation, made on behalf of the detenu, should be considered and disposed of with a sense of urgency and without any avoidable delay.

11. In the light of the above fact and law, we have no hesitation in quashing the order of detention on the ground of delay on the part of the Government in disposing of the representations of the detenu.

Accordingly, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the detention order passed by second respondent against the detenu Saran @ Saranraj S/o.Sankar in No.210/BCDFGISSSV/2018 dated 10.04.2018 is quashed. The detenu is directed to be set at liberty, forthwith, unless his presence is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS VII)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

gm

To

1.The Secretary to Government,
Department of Home, Prohibition and Excise,
Secretariat, Fort St.George,
Chennai.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Office of Commissioner of Police,
Vepery, Chennai - 7.

3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

4.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Puzhal, Chennai.

5.The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (law & Order) Department,
Fort St.George, Madras-9

H.C.P.No.970 of 2018

GSP(03/10/2018)



WEB COPY