



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 01.07.2019

Coram

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

H.C.P. No.799 of 2019

Sridhar @ Aadu Sridhar ... Petitioner/Petitioner

-vs-

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

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Chennai.

... Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the 2nd respondent dated 16.02.2019 in No.85/BCDFGISSSV/2019 the detenu Sridhar @ Aadu Sridhar, M/A 31, son of Gnanasekar, who is confined at Central Prison, Puzhal and to set aside the same and consequently direct the respondents to produce the detenu before this Court and set him at liberty.


For Petitioner : Mr.K.S.Kaviarasu

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

ORDER

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

The petitioner, Sridhar @ Aadu Sridhar, son of Gnanasekar, aged 31 years, is the detenu. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in No.85/BCDFGISSSV/2019, dated 16.02.2019, holding to be a "Goonda", as contemplated



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.

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.

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. It is the contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 01.04.2019 and there was 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 inordinate delay of 18 days in considering the representation. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 02.05.2019.

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>



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.

WEB COPY

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 4 days in submitting the remarks 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 No.85/BCDFGISSSV/2019, dated 16.02.2019, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, Sridhar @ Aadu Sridhar, son of Gnanasekar, aged 31 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

s/d-
Assistant Registrar

True Copy

Sub-Assistant Registrar

mmi/ssm
To:

1. The Secretary to the Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Chennai.
3. The Superintendent
Central Prison, Puzhal, 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.799 of 2019

NMI (CO)
SP(07/08/2019)