



**BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
DATED:21.06.2018**

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE Mr. JUSTICE C.T.SELVAM
and**

WEB COPY THE HONOURABLE Mr. JUSTICE A.M.BASHEER AHAMED

H.C.P.(MD)No.642 of 2018

S.Padmavathi

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu represented by
Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tirunelveli District,
Tirunelveli-627 009.
3. The Inspector of Police,
Mukkudal Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.
4. The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Palayamkottai. ... Respondents

PRAYER: The petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the entire records, relating to the detention order passed by the second respondent in M.H.S.Confdl.No.31/2018, dated 10.04.2018 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu by name Sakthi @ Sakthivel, S/o.Kaliappathevar, aged about 34 years before this Court and set him at liberty, now detained at Central Prison, Palayamkottai.

For Petitioner	: Mr.S.R.A.Ramachandhran
For Respondents	: Mr.V.Neelakandan
	Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu, viz., Sakthi @ Sakthivel, S/o.Kaliappathevar, aged about 34 years. The detenu has been detained by detention order in M.H.S.Confdl.No.31/2018, dated 10.04.2018, holding him to be a "Goonda", as contemplated under 2(i) of Tamil Nadu Act, 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this Habeas Corpus Petition.



2. We have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor 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 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 10.04.2018. The petitioner made a representation dated 21.04.2018. Thereafter, remarks were duly received on 18.05.2018. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the representation on 01.06.2018.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of **10** days in considering the representation of the petitioner, by the Government.

7. In **Rekha Vs. State of Tamil Nadu**, [2011 (5) SCC 244], the Hon'ble 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**, [2007 (2) MWN (Cr.) 145], a Division Bench of this Court has held that the unexplained delay of **five** 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**, [1980 (2) SCC 321], the Hon'ble 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 in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority in considering the representation. The impugned detention order is, therefore, liable to be quashed.

11. In the result, the Detention Order, passed by the second respondent, in his proceedings in M.H.S.Confdl.No.31/2018, dated 10.04.2018, is quashed. The detenu, namely, Sakthi @ Sakthivel, S/o.Kaliappathevar, aged about 34 years, is ordered to be set at liberty forthwith, if his detention is not required in connection with any other case.

12. In the upshot, we allow the Habeas Corpus Petition.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CO)

/True copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1. The Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Tirunelveli District, Tirunelveli-627 009.
3. The Inspector of Police,
Mukkudal Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.
4. The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Palayamkottai.
5. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law and Order),
Fort.St.George, Chennai - 9.
6. The Addl.Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

+1cc to Mr.S.R.A.Ramachandhran, Advocate Sr.No.69249

DAS/RJ2

VB/PN/SAR2/10.07.2018/3P/8C