



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 26.11.2019

Coram

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice M.M.SUNDRESH
and
The Hon'ble Mr. Justice RMT. TEEKAA RAMAN

H.C.P. No. 1970 of 2019

Krishnammal

... Petitioner

-vs-

1.The State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. by Secretary to Government,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai - 600 009.

2.The District Magistrate & District Collector,
Salem District,
Salem.

... 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 dated 14.08.2019 passed by the second respondent in his proceedings No.C.M.P.No.30/Goonda/C2/2019 and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's son namely, Murugesan, son of Kandan, aged about 51 years, residing at Sandhaipettai, Kadaiyampatti Taluk, Salem District, who is presently undergoing detention in the Central Prison, Salem as Goonda under Section 2(f) of the Tamilnadu Prevention of Dangerous Activiteis of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 (Tamilnadu Act 14 of 1982) before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Prabakaran

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, Murugesan, son of Kandan, male, aged about 51 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in C.M.P.No.30/Goonda/C2/2019 dated 14.08.2019, 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 14.08.2019. The petitioner made a representation on 17.08.2019. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 26.08.2019. The remarks were duly received on 25.09.2019. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 30.09.2019.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 30 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 10 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 20 days in submitting the remarks.



WEB COPY

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 20 days in submitting the representation. 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 C.M.P.No.30/Goonda/C2/2019 dated 14.08.2019, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Murugesan, son of Kandan, male, aged about 51 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar (CS-VIII)

// True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

mmi/ssm

To

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



2.The District Magistrate & District Collector,
Salem District,
Salem.

3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Salem.

4.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P. No. 1970 of 2019

GP (CO)
CSR(10/01/2020)