



WEB COPY

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.415 of 2019

K.Yashoda

... Petitioner

-vs-

- 1.The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. By its Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Office of Commissioner of Police,
Veppery, Chennai
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison No.2,
Puzhal, Chennai - 66.

... Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the entire records from the 2nd respondent in connection with order in Memo No.52/BCDFGISSSV/2019, dated 06.02.2019 and quash the same and produce the petitioner's son namely Thiru. Arivazhagan S/o. Karuppaiah, aged 31 years, now confined in Central Prison, No.2, Puzhal, Chennai - 66 under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 before this Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Pugalenthi

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



ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by M.M.SUNDRESH, J.]

WEB COPY

The petitioner is the mother of Arivazhagan S/o. Karuppaiah, aged 31 years, who is the detenu. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Memo No.52/BCDFGISSSV/2019, dated 06.02.2019, 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 06.02.2019. The petitioner made a representation on 18.02.2019. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 25.02.2019. The remarks were duly received on 07.03.2019. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 25.04.2019.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 10 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 2 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 8 days in submitting the remarks.



7. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 07.03.2019 and there was delay of 49 days in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister for Electricity, Prohibition and Excise Department after the Deputy Secretary dealt with it, of which 17 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was inordinate delay of 32 days in considering the representation. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 25.04.2019.

8. 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.

9. 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.

10. In *Tara Chand vs. State of Rajasthan and others*, reported in 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.

11. In the subject case, admittedly, there is an inordinate and unexplained delay of 8 days in submitting the remarks and 32 days in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister for Electricity, Prohibition and Excise Department. The impugned detention order is, therefore, liable to be quashed.

12. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in Memo No.52/BCDFGISSSV/2019, dated 06.02.2019, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, Arivazhagan S/o. Karuppaiah, aged 31 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CCC)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

mmi/ssm



To:

- 1.The Secretary,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Office of Commissioner of Police,
Veppery, Chennai
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison No.2,
Puzhal, Chennai - 66
- 4.The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law and Order),
Fort St.George,
Chennai-9.
- 5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P. No.415 of 2019

BP(CO)

RRS(01/08/2019)