



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 12.07.2021

Coram

The Honourable Mr. Justice P.N.PRAKASH
and
The Honourable Mr. Justice R.PONGIAPPAN

H.C.P.No.63 of 2021

Visalachi

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1. State of Tamil Nadu represented by
The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Collector & District Magistrate,
Nagapattinam District, Nagapattinam.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Nagapattinam, Nagapattinam District.
4. The Inspector of Police,
Sembanarkoil Police Station,
Nagapattinam District.
5. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Thiruchirappalli.

.. Respondents

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 proceedings of the 2nd respondent herein in C.O.C.No.62/2020 dated 18.12.2020 and quash the same and produce the detenu Kalakki @ Kattapomman, aged about 23 years, son of Rajendran, TPDA No.9365, now detained in Central Prison, Thiruchirappalli, before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.



WEB COPY

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Sarath Chandran
for Mr.K.M.Vijayan
Associates

For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj,
Govt.Advocate
(Crl.Side)

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by P.N.PRAKASH, J.]


The petitioner is the mother of the detenu Kalakki @ Kattapomman, aged about 23 years, son of Rajendran. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in C.O.C.No.62/2020 dated 18.12.2020, 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 Government Advocate (Crl.Side) 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 Government Advocate (Crl.Side) 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 Government Advocate (Crl.Side), 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 18.12.2020. The petitioner made a representation on 16.12.2020. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 19.02.2021. The remarks were duly



6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 26 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which, 8 days were Government Holidays and hence there was an inordinate delay of 18 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 17.03.2021 and there was a delay of 26 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 9 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was an inordinate delay of 17 days in considering the representation.

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 18 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 17 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.

In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in C.O.C.No.62/2020 dated 18.12.2020, passed



by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Kalakki @ Kattapomman, aged about 23 years, son of Rajendran, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

WEB COPY

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CO)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

nsd

To

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The District Collector & District Magistrate,
Nagapattinam District, Nagapattinam.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Nagapattinam, Nagapattinam District.
4. The Inspector of Police,
Sembanarkoil Police Station,
Nagapattinam District.
5. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Thiruchirappalli.
6. The Joint Secretary to Government of Tamil Nadu,
Public, Law and Order Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 9.
7. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

H.C.P.No.63 of 2021

SSN(CO)
PM(30/07/2021)