



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 26.05.2020

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M.SUNDRESH
AND
THE HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE P.T.ASHA

H.C.P. NO.2858 OF 2019

K.Oosiraja

...Petitioner

-vs-

1. The State of Tamil Nadu
rep.by its Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort.St.George,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Collector,
District Magistrate,
Krishnagiri District,
Krishnagiri.

...Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records of the second respondent herein pertaining to the detention order made in S.C.No.30 of 2019, dated 21.11.2019 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body of the detainee Mrs.Pottiyammal, wife of Kannamani, aged about 50 years, now detained in Special Prison for Women, Vellore before this Court and set the detainee at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner .. Mr.P.Saravanan
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 son of Pottiyammal, female, aged 50 years, W/o.Kannamani who is the detainee. The detainee has been detained by the second respondent by his order in S.C.No.30 of 2019, dated 21.11.2019, holding her 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 detainee 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 21.11.2019. The petitioner made a representation on 10.12.2019. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 13.12.2019. The remarks were duly received on 09.01.2020. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 20.01.2020.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 27 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 10 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 17 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 09.01.2020 and there was delay of 7 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 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.

WEB COPY

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 17 days in submitting the remarks and 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 S.C.No.30 of 2019 dated 21.11.2019, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, namely, Pottiyammal, female, aged 50 years, W/o.Kannamani is directed to be released forthwith unless her detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

mmi/ms

To

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort.St.George,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Collector,
District Magistrate,
Krishnagiri District,
Krishnagiri.



3. The Superintendent,
Special Prison for Women,
Vellore.

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

5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.2858 of 2019

AD(CO)
KKV/14/07/2020