



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 12.07.2019

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M.SUNDRESH
AND
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M. NIRMAL KUMAR

H.C.P. No.927 of 2019

Kumutha

... Petitioner

-Vs-.

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

2.The Commissioner of Police,
The Greater Chennai City,
Vepery, Chennai. - 7

... Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records relating to the detention order in Memo No. 160/BCDFGISSSV/2019 dated 01.04.2019 passed by the 2nd respondent under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and set aside the same and direct the respondent to produce the petitioner's son Vinoth Kumar S/o Nandakumar aged about 30 years the detenu, now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this Court and set the petitioner's son Vinoth Kumar S/o. Nandakumar aged about 30 years the detenu herein at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Bennington

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, Vinoth Kumar, S/o Nandakumar, aged about 30 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Memo No. 160/BCDFGISSSV/2019 dated 01.04.2019, holding 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 01.04.2019. The petitioner made a representation dated 06.05.2019. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 08.05.2019. The remarks were duly received on 14.05.2019. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 20.05.2019.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 14.05.2019 and there was delay of 6 days in submitting the remarks, of which, two days were Government Holidays. It is the further contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that there was a delay of 6 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 2 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was inordinate delay of 4 days in considering the representation. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 20.05.2019.

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.

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 4 days in submitting the remarks and 4 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. 160/BCDFGISSSV/2019 dated 01.04.2019 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, Vinoth Kumar, S/o Nandakumar, aged about 30 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

mmi/ssm

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1.The Secretary,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009

2.The Commissioner of Police,
The Greater Chennai City,
Vepery, Chennai. - 7



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

4. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law & Order),
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.

5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P. No. 927 of 2019

Kak(14/09/2019)