



**BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT**

**DATED : 24.07.2020**

**CORAM:**

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.KALYANASUNDARAM  
and  
THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE T.KRISHNAVALLI**

**H.C.P. (MD) No.1112 of 2019**

Dhanagopal

... Petitioner

-vs-

1.The Secretary to Government,  
Government of Tamil Nadu,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise IX,  
Secretariat,  
Chennai - 600 009.

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,  
Madurai District,  
Madurai.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,  
Madurai Central Prison,  
Madurai.

... Respondents

**PRAYER:** Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a writ of habeas corpus calling for the records on the file of the second respondent in B.C.D.F.G.I.S.S.S.V No.29/2019 and set aside the order of detention passed therein dated 02.10.2019; direct the respondents to produce the detenu by name Balakumar @ Beedibala Male, aged 27 years before this Court now detained at Central Prison, Madurai and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.J.William Christopher

For Respondents : Mr.V.Neelakandan  
Additional Public Prosecutor

**O R D E R**

**[Order of the Court was made by K.KALYANASUNDARAM, J.]**

The present Habeas Corpus Petition has been filed to assail the detention order passed by the second respondent in B.C.D.F.G.I.S.S.S.V No.29/2019 dated 02.10.2019, wherein the son of the petitioner, namely, Balakumar @ Beedibala aged about 27 years



has been detained as 'Goonda' as contemplated under Section 2(f) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982.

2. Though several grounds have been raised challenging the impugned order of detention passed by the second respondent, dated 02.10.2019, Mr.J.William Christopher, learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that the procedural safeguards guaranteed under Article 21 and 22 of the Constitution of India has been violated and there is an inordinate and unexplained delay in considering the representation of the petitioner and on this sole ground, the detention order is liable to be set aside.

3. Per contra, Mr.V.Neelakandan, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents would argue that the detaining authority, namely, the second respondent herein, after being satisfied with the materials produced by the sponsoring authority, has passed the detention order only to prevent the detenu from indulging in similar offence in future. He would further state that the delay, if any, in considering the representation would not cause any prejudice to the detenu and there is no infirmity or irregularity in the order of detention passed by the second respondent. Hence, he prayed for dismissal of the Habeas Corpus Petition.

4. We have heard the rival submissions and perused the materials available on records.

5. In the matter on hand, the son of the petitioner has been detained by the order of the second respondent dated 02.10.2019. It is seen that a representation dated 12.10.2019 has been sent to the respondents and the same was received on 15.10.2019. Remarks were called for on 16.10.2019 and the remarks were received on 04.11.2019. The Under Secretary and the Deputy Secretary dealt with the matter on 05.11.2019. The concerned Minister dealt with the matter on 27.11.2019 and thereafter, the petitioner's representation was rejected on 29.11.2019.

6. It is seen that there was delay of 21 days between 05.11.2019 and 27.11.2019. It is also seen that there are 5 Government holidays and after excluding the same, there is a delay of 16 days in considering the representation of the petitioner. It is the contention of the petitioner that the delay of 16 days in considering the representation of the petitioner was not properly explained. It is well settled that if the delay is not explained, the right guaranteed under the Constitution of India has been violated.

7. At this juncture, it is useful to refer the decision of the Honourable Apex Court in the case of **Rajammal vs. State of Tamil**

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>



**Nadu and another**, reported in **1999 (1) SCC 417**, wherein it is held as follows:

"7. It is a Constitutional obligation of the Government to consider the representation forwarded by the detenu without any delay. Though no period is prescribed by Article 22 of the consideration for the decision to be taken on the representation, the words 'as soon as may be' in Clause (5) of Article 22 convey the message that the representation should be considered and disposed of at the earliest. But that does not mean that the authority is preempted from explaining the delay which would have occasioned in the disposal of the representation. The Court can certainly consider whether the delay was occasioned due to permissible reasons or unavoidable caused. This position has been well delineated by a Constitution Bench of this Court in *M.M.Abdulla Kunhi v. Union of India*, 1991 (1) SCC (Cri) 613. The following observations of the Bench can profitably be extracted here: (SCC 484, Para 12)

"It is a Constitutional mandate commanding the authority concerned to whom the detenu submits his representation to consider the representation and dispose of the same as expeditiously as possible. The words 'as soon as may be' occurring in Clause (5) of Article 22 reflects the concern of the Framers that the representation should be expeditiously considered and dispose of with a sense of urgency without any avoidable delay. However, there can be no hard and fast rule in this regard. It depends upon the facts and circumstances of each case. There is no period prescribed either under the Constitution or under the Detention Law concerned within which the representation should be dealt with. The requirement, however, is that there should not be supine indifference, slackness or callous attitude in considering the representation. Any unexplained delay in the disposal of representation would be a breach of the Constitutional imperative and it would render the continued detention impermissible and illegal."

8. The position, therefore, now is that if delay was caused on account of nay indifference or lapse in considering the representation, such delay will adversely affect further detention of the prisoner. In



other words, it is for the authority concerned to explain the delay, if any, in disposing of the representation. It is not enough to say that the delay was very short. Even longer delay can as well be explained. So the test is not the duration or range of delay, but how it is explained by the authority concerned."

8. In the case on hand, there is absolutely no explanation for the delay between 05.11.2019 and 27.11.2019. Even after excluding 5 Government holidays, there is unexplained delay of 16 days in considering the representation of the detenu. 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.

9. In fine, the order of detention passed by the second respondent, in B.C.D.F.G.I.S.S.S.V No.29/2019 dated 02.10.2019, is set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. Consequently, the detenu, namely, Balakumar @ Beedibala son of Dhanagopal, aged 27 years now detained at Central Prison, Madurai is directed to be released forthwith unless his presence or custody or detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar ( )

// True Copy //

/ /2020

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS )

skn

**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 Secretary to Government,  
Government of Tamil Nadu,  
Home, Prohibition and Excise IX,  
Secretariat,  
Chennai - 600 009.

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>



2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,  
Madurai District,  
Madurai.

3.The Superintendent of Prison,  
Madurai Central Prison,  
Madurai.

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

5.The Additional Public Prosecutor,  
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,  
Madurai.

**H.C.P. (MD) No.1112 of 2019**  
**24.07.2020**

SPU(31.07.2020)5P 6C