

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 28.05.2020

Coram

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

The Hon'ble Ms. Justice P.T.ASHA

H.C.P.No.2428 of 2019

C.Saraswathi Petitioner/Wife of the Detenue

-vs-

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by its Principal Secretary,
Home, Prohibition & Excise Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.

2.The District Magistrate and the District Collector,
Salem District,
Salem.

3.The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Salem.

.... Respondents

Prayer:Habeas Corpus 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 the 2nd Respondent dated 21.09.2019, in C.M.P.No.42/GOONDAS/C2/2019 and quash the same and direct the Respondents to produce the Detenue namely, A.Chinnaiyan, aged 56 years, son of Arumugam, before this Court, now confined at Central Prison, Salem, and set him at liberty forthwith.

WEB COPY

For Petitioner .. Mr.K.Selvaraj

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 Chinnaiyan, male, aged 56 years, S/o.Arumugam, who is the detenu. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in C.M.P.No.42/GOONDA/C2/2019 dated 21.09.2019, holding him to be a "Goonda", as contemplated under Section 2(f) of the 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 21.09.2019. The petitioner made a representation on 04.11.2019. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 11.11.2019. The remarks were duly received on 11.11.2019. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 16.12.2019.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 11.12.2019 and there was delay of 3 days in considering the representation by the Hon'ble Minister for Electricity, Prohibition and Excise Department after the Deputy Secretary dealt with it, hence, there was inordinate delay of 3 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 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 C.M.P.No.42/GOONDA/C2/2019 dated 21.09.2019, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Chinnaiyan, male, aged 56 years, S/o.Arumugam, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS IV)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

mmi/msr
To

1.The Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai 600 009.

2.The District Magistrate and the District Collector,
Salem District, Salem.


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

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

5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.2428 of 2019

mr[col
srg 03/08/2020



WEB COPY