

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 24.06.2019

Coram

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

H.C.P.No.660 of 2019

Nithiya Rubi

.. Petitioner

Vs

1.State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by The Secretary,
Home,Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai - 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
The Greater Chennai City,
Vepery, Chennai - 600 007.

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for a writ of habeas corpus, calling for the records relating to the detention order in Memo No.98/BCDFGISSSV/2019 dated 22.02.2019 passed by the second respondent under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondent to produce the petitioner's husband Sathish S/o. Anthonydoss, aged about 36 years the detenu, now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this Hon'ble Court and set the petitioner's husband Sathish S/o. Anthonydoss aged about 36 years the detenu herein at liberty.

For Petitioner .. Mr.D.Gopikrishnan

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

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the husband of Sathish S/o. Anthonydoss, aged about 36 years, who is the detenu. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Memo No.98/BCDFGISSSV/2019 dated 22.02.2019, 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 22.02.2019. The petitioner made a representation on 25.03.2019. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 26.03.2019. The remarks were duly received on 01.04.2019. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 02.05.2019.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 6 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 2 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 4 days in submitting the remarks. Thereafter, there was another delay of 29 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 11 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was another inordinate delay of 18 days in considering the representation.

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 4 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and 18 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.98/BCDFGISSSV/2019 dated 22.02.2019 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Sathish S/o. Anthonydoss, aged about 36 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

WEB COPY

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

mmi

To

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

2.The Commissioner of Police,
The Greater Chennai City,
Vepery, Chennai - 600 007.


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

4.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

5. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law & Order),Fort St.George,Chennai-9.

H.C.P.No.660 of 2019

br(co)
nr 26/07/2019



WEB COPY