

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 05.10.2020

Coram

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice M.M.SUNDRESH
and
The Hon'ble Mr. Justice D.KRISHNAKUMAR

H.C.P. No. 674 of 2020

V.Pramila

.. Petitioner /Wife
of the deteneue

Vs.

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St.George, Chennai.
- 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Master Plan Complex,
Collector's Office,
Tiruvallur,
Tiruvallur District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
O/o.Superintendent Office,
Jaya Nagar,
Chinna Ekkadu - 602 001
Tiruvallur District
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison-II,
Puzhal,
Chennai-600 006

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the entire records relating to the petitioner's husband detention under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 vide detention order, dated 27.02.2020 on the file of the second respondent herein made in proceedings Memo BCDFGISSSV No.03/2020, and quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's husband namely Venkatesan, S/o.Sengalvarayan, aged 36 years, before this Court and set the petitioner's husband at liberty from detention, now the petitioner's husband detained in Central Prison-II, Puzhal.

Page numbers

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Arunprasad

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 wife of the detenu, Venkatesan, S/o.Sengalvarayan, aged 36 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in BCDFGISSSV No.03/2020, dated 27.02.2020 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. सत्यमेव जयते

5. The Detention Order in question was passed on 27.02.2020. The petitioner made a representation on 18.03.2020. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 24.04.2020. The remarks were duly received on 20.08.2020. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 04.09.2020.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 119 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining

Page numbers

Authority, of which 37 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 82 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 20.08.2020 and there was delay of 14 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 4 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was inordinate delay of 10 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 82 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 10 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 BCDGISSSV No.03/2020, dated 27.02.2020, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Venkatesan, S/o.Sengalvarayan, aged 36 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CJ conf)

//True Copy//


Sub Assistant Registrar

Page numbers

mmi/ssm

To

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Fort St.George, Chennai.
- 2.The District Magistrate and District Collector,
Master Plan Complex,
Collector's Office,
Tiruvallur,
Tiruvallur District.
- 3.The Joint Secretary to Govt.,
Public Law & Order,
Fort St.George, Chennai-9.
- 4.The Superintendent of Police,
O/o.Superintendent Office,
Jaya Nagar,
Chinna Ekkadu - 602 001
Tiruvallur District
- 5.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison-II,
Puzhal,
Chennai-600 006.
- 6.The Inspector of Police,
Uthukottai Police Station,
Tiruvallur District.
- 7.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



H.C.P. No.674 of 2020

PVS (CO)
CB(03/11/2020)

WEB COPY

Page numbers