

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 08.10.2020

Coram

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

H.C.P. No. 715 of 2020

Subramanian

... Petitioner

-vs-

1. The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by Additional Chief Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.

2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Goondas Section,
Vepery, Chennai - 07.

... Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of habeas corpus calling for the records relating to the detention order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 05.02.2020 in Memo No.66/BCDFGISSSV/2020 against the petitioner's son/detenu Senthilkumar, S/o.Subramani, Hindu, aged 42 years who is now confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce him before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Devaraj

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 father of Senthilkumar, S/o.Subramani, Hindu, aged 42 years, who is the detenu. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in

No.66/BCDFGISSSV/2020 dated 05.02.2020, 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 and we have also perused the records carefully.

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 05.02.2020. The petitioner has made a representation on 27.02.2020. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 28.02.2020. The remarks were duly received on 04.03.2020. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 16.03.2020.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 5 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 2 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 3 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 04.03.2020 and there was delay of 12 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 8 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 3 days in submitting the remarks and 8 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.66/BCDFGISSSV/2020 dated 05.02.2020 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Senthilkumar, S/o.Subramani, Hindu, aged 42 years is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Goondas Section,
Vepery, Chennai - 07.

3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai 66.

4. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

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

+1cc to Mr.M.Devaraj, Advocate, Sr.No.33270

H.C.P. No. 715 of 2020

pa (co)
rr ii (04/11/2020)