



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 17.12.2020

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.KALYANASUNDARAM

and

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE T.KRISHNAVALLI

H.C.P. (MD) No.361 of 2020

K.Mohamed Ismail

...Petitioner

-vs-

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 Magistrate and District Collector

Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector

Dindigul District

3.The Superintendent of Prison

Madurai Central Prison

Madurai District

...Respondents

PRAYER : Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the entire records connected with the detention order of the respondent No.2 in Detention Order No.21/2020, dated 18.03.2020 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the detenu by name Mohammed Mujahith, son of Mohammed Ismail, aged about 21 years, now detained as "Goonda" at Madurai Central Prison, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Alagumani

For Respondents : Mr.K.Dinesh Babu

Additional Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

(Order of the Court was made by K.KALYANASUNDARAM, J.)

This habeas corpus petition has been filed by the father of the detenu, namely, Mohammed Mujahith, aged about 21 years, challenging the detention order No.21/2020, dated 18.03.2020, passed by the second respondent, branding him as "Goonda" as contemplated under Section 2(f) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982.

2. Mr.R.Alagumani, learned counsel for the petitioner, would argue that even though the petitioner has raised several grounds, he has confined his arguments only to the delay in disposal of the petitioner's representation. It is submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the procedural safeguards guaranteed under



Articles 21 and 22 of the Constitution of India have not been followed in this case and there is unexplained and inordinate delay in disposal of the petitioner's representation, which would vitiate the impugned order of detention.

3. Mr.K.Dinesh Babu, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, while reiterating the counter filed by the second respondent, submitted that after satisfying with the materials placed by the Sponsoring Authority, the Detaining Authority has passed the detention order and there is no illegality or infirmity in the detention order. It is also stated that even if there is any delay in disposal of the representation, it has not caused any prejudice to the rights of the detenu and hence, prayed for dismissal of the habeas corpus petition.

4. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

5. In the instant case, the proforma furnished by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor would indicate that as against the impugned detention order, the petitioner made a representation to the first respondent on 18.06.2020 and it was received on 24.06.2020. Remarks were called for on 25.06.2020 and it was received on 21.07.2020. The Deputy Secretary dealt with the matter on the same day i.e.21.07.2020. The concerned Minister dealt with the matter on 24.07.2020 and the representation came to be rejected on 28.07.2020. It is seen that in between 25.06.2020 and 21.07.2020, there was a delay of 22 days, after excluding the Government Holidays of five days, in considering the petitioner's representation.

6. At this juncture, it is useful to refer the decision of the Honourable Apex Court in the case of **Rajammal vs. State of Tamil Nadu and another**, reported in **1999 (1) SCC 417**, wherein the Apex Court has observed and held that it is for the Authority concerned to explain the delay, if any, in disposal of the representation and if any delay was caused on account of nay indifference or lapse in considering the representation, such delay will adversely affect further detention of the prisoner.

7. In the case on hand, as stated supra, the delay of 22 days in considering the representation of the petitioner has not been properly explained by the respondents. Hence, in our considered view, the detention order is liable to be set aside solely on the ground of delay by following the decision of the Honourable Apex Court referred supra.

8. In fine, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detention order No.21/2020, dated 18.03.2020, passed by the second respondent, is set aside. Consequently, the detenu, namely,



Mohammed Mujahith, son of Mohammed Ismail, aged about 21 years, who is now detained at Madurai Central Prison, is directed to be released forthwith unless his presence or custody or detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CSIII)

// True Copy //

/ /2020

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

Note :

In view of the present lock down owing to COVID-19 pandemic, a web copy of the order may be utilized for official purposes, but, ensuring that the copy of the order that is presented is the correct copy, shall be the responsibility of the advocate / litigant concerned.

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 Magistrate and District Collector,
Office of the District Magistrate and District Collector,
Dindigul District.
- 3.The Superintendent of Prison,
Madurai Central Prison,
Madurai District.
4. The Joint Secretary to Government,
Public (Law &Order) Department,
Fort St.Goerge,
Chennai 600 009.
- 5.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

H.C.P. (MD) No.361 of 2020
17.12.2020

MJ(CO)
KB(28.12.2020) 3P 6C