



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 27.06.2019

Coram

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

H.C.P. No.649 of 2019

Sundari

... Petitioner

-vs-

1.The Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600 009.

2.District Collector and
District Magistrate,
Vellore District,
Vellore 9

... Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the second respondent dated 14.03.2019 in Memo No.C3/D.O.No.26/2019 against the petitioner's son Thangaraj, Male, aged 28 years, S/o.Lakshmipathi, who is confined at Central Prison, Vellore and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Balaji

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

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the mother of the detenu, Thangaraj, S/o.Lakshmipathi, aged about 28 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Memo No.C3/D.O.No.26/2019, dated 14.03.2019, holding him to be a



१३.५ प्रमेय ५२८

petiti

petiti

petiti

petiti

petiti



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 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 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 of 13 days in submitting the remarks and 14 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.

11. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in Memo No.C3/D.O.No.26/2019, dated 14.03.2019 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, Thangaraj, S/o.Lakshmipathi, aged about 28 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

-s/d-
Assistant Registrar (CS-II)


True Copy

Sub-Assistant Registrar

mmi/ssm

To:

1. The Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.



2.District Collector and
District Magistrate,
Vellore District,
Vellore 9

WEB COPY

3.The Superintendent
Central Prison,Vellore.

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.649 of 2019

BP(CO)
SP(01/08/2019)