

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 09.10.2020

Coram

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

H.C.P. No. 740 of 2020

Selvasubramaniyan

... Petitioner

-vs-

1. The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by its Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Fort St. George, Chennai 09.
2. The Commissioner of Police
Greater Chennai
Chennai District.
3. The Superintendent
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.
4. The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch
Greater Chennai.

... Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ or order or direction or writ in the nature of the Writ of Habeas Corpus or any other appropriate writ or order or direction to produce the body of petitioner's son named Selvaprabhu son of Selvasubramaniyan, aged about 28 years presently confined at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai before this Hon'ble Court and set him at livery forthwith, after calling for the records pertaining to the detention order dated 06.03.2020 made in No.166/BCDFGISSSV/2020 passed by the 2nd respondent and quash the same.

Page numbers

For Petitioner : Mr.N. Ponraj

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 Selvaprabhu, aged 28 years, who is the detenu. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in No.166/BCDFGISSSV/2020 dated 06.03.2020, 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 06.03.2020. The petitioner has made a representation on 30.03.2020. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 07.05.2020. The remarks were duly received on 13.05.2020. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 26.05.2020.

Page numbers

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 further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 14.05.2020 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 4 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.166/BCDFGISSSV/2020 dated 06.03.2020, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Selvaprabhu, son of Selva Subramanian, aged about 28 years is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-III)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

Page numbers


mmi/ssm

To

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai 09
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Chennai District.
- 3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch,
Greater Chennai
- 5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.
- 6.The Joint Secretary to Govt.,
Public(Law & Order)
Fort St.George, Chennai-9.

BR(CO)
CB(23/11/2020)

H.C.P. No. 740 of 2020



WEB COPY

Page numbers