

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 14.06.2019

Coram

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice M.M.SUNDRESH
and
The Hon'ble Mr. Justice M.NIRMAL KUMAR

H.C.P.No.417 of 2019

Mohan

..Petitioner

Vs

- 1.The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. By its Secretary to the Govt,
Department of Prohibition and Excise(Home),
Fort St. George, Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector,
Tiruvallur District,
Tiruvallur ..Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for a writ of habeas corpus to call for the records in No.38/BCDFGISSSV/2018 dated 13.12.2018 on the file of second respondent herein and set aside the same as illegal and produce the detenu Mohan, Son of Sekar, aged about 30 years, who is confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai before Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner.. Mr.Ilayaraja Kandasamy

For Respondents.. Mr.C.Iyyappa Raj,
Addl. Public Prosecutor

WEB COPY
ORDER
(Order of the Court was made by M.M.SUNDRESH, J.)

The petitioner - Mohan, Son of Sekar, aged about 30 years is the detenu. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in No.38/BCDFGISSSV/2018 dated 13.12.2018, holding him to be a "Goonda", as

contemplated under Section 2(f) 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 appearing for the petitioner and the 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 13.12.2018. The petitioner made a representation on 10.05.2019. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 13.05.2019. The remarks were duly received on 07.06.2019. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 26 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 7 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 21 days in submitting the remarks.

7. In *Rekha vs. State of Tamil Nadu* (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 (2007 (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 21 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority. 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 No.38/BCDFGISSSV/2018 dated 13.12.2018, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Mohan, Son of Sekar, aged about 30 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS III)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

mmi/ssm
To

- 1.The Secretary to Govt,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.
2. The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector,
Tiruvallur District,Tiruvallur
- 3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,Puzhal II, Chennai.
- 4.The Public Prosecutor,High Court, Madras.
- 5.The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law and order) Fort.St.George, Chennai 9.

H.C.P.No. 417 of 2019

A.SK(30/07/2019)