

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 01.12.2020

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.M.SUNDRESH

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE D.KRISHNAKUMAR

H.C.P.NO.992 of 2020

Shanthi

...Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The State rep. By its,
The Secretary to the Government (Home),
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Government of Tamilnadu, Fort St. George,
Chennai 600 009.
 - 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Collector and
District Magistrate, Krishnagiri District,
Krishnagiri.
 - 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Salem, Salem District.
 - 4.The Superintendent of Police,
O/o. Superintendent of Police, Krishnagiri District.
 - 5.The Inspector of Police,
Hosur Town Police Station,
Krishnagiri District.
- ..Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of Writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records pertaining to the order of Detention dated 28.04.2020 passed by the 2nd respondent bearing No. S.C.No.22/2020 and quash the same and produce the detenu Allibaba @ Govindaraj, S/o. Duraisamy aged about 25 years before this Court and set him at Liberty forthwith from Central Prison, Salem.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Thirumoorthy

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 Allibaba @ Govindaraj, S/o. Duraisamy, male, aged about 25 years, who is the detenu. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in S.C.No.22/2020 dated 28.04.2020, 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.

5. The Detention Order in question was passed on 28.04.2020. The petitioner made a representation dated NIL. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 21.05.2020. The remarks were duly received on 09.07.2020. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 24.07.2020.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 49 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 15 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 34 days in submitting the remarks.

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 34 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority. 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 S.C.No.22/2020 dated 28.04.2020, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Allibaba @ Govindaraj, S/o. Duraisamy, male, aged about 25 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

ssm

To

- 1.The Secretary to the Government (Home),
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Government of Tamilnadu, Fort St. George,
Chennai 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Office of the District Collector and
District Magistrate, Krishnagiri District,
Krishnagiri.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Salem, Salem District.
- 4.The Superintendent of Police,
O/o.Superintendent of Police, Krishnagiri District.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Hosur Town Police Station,
Krishnagiri District.
- 6.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.
- 7.The Joint Secretary to Government
Public (Law and Order),
Fort St.George,Chennai-600 009.

H.C.P. No.992 of 2020

EV (CO)
UM (11.12.2020)

सत्यमेव जयते

WEB COPY