



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED 19.07.2021

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH

AND

THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE R.PONGIAPPAN

H.C.P.No.105 of 2021

Mani

..Petitioner/Father of
the deteue

Vs.

1.The Secretary to the Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Secretariat, Chennai-9

2.The District Collector and
District Magistrate of Vellore District
Vellore-9

3.The Superintendent of Police
Vellore District, Vellore

4.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Vellore-2

5.The Inspector of Police
Ariyur Police Station
Vellore District

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS to call for the entire records in connection with the order of detention passed by the 2nd respondent dated 08.01.2021 in C3/D.O.No.003/2021 against the petitioner's son viz., Pulsar Sunil, S/o.Mani, aged about 34 years, who is confined at Central Prison, Vellore and set aside the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu before this Hon'ble Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Senthil Vel

For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj

Government Advocate (Crl. Side)



O R D E R

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

WEB COPY

The petitioner is the father of the detenu viz., Pulsar Sunil, S/o.Mani, aged about 34 years. The detenu has been detained by the 2nd respondent by his order dated 08.01.2021 in C3/D.O.No.003/2021, 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) filed his counter affidavit and strongly 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 08.01.2021. The petitioner made a representation on 22.01.2021. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 29.01.2021. The remarks were duly received on 30.03.2021. Thereafter, the Government considered the matter and passed the order rejecting the petitioner's representation on 15.04.2021.

6. It is the contention of the petitioner that there was a delay of 60 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 18 days were Government Holidays and hence, there was an inordinate delay of 42 days in submitting the remarks. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the



remarks were received on 30.03.2021 and there was a delay of 13 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 5 days were Government Holidays, hence, there was inordinate delay of 8 days in considering the representation.

7. In *Rekha Vs. State of Tamil Nadu* [2011 (5) SCC 244], the Hon'ble 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 Hon'ble 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 42 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 8 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 C3/D.O.No.003/2021, dated 08.01.2021, passed by the 2nd respondent is set aside. The detenu viz., Pulsar Sunil, S/o.Mani, aged about 34 years, is directed to be released forthwith, unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

s/d-

Assistant Registrar(CS VII)

True Copy

Sub-Assistant Registrar

gya



To
WEB COPY

1.The Secretary to Government
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department
Secretariat, Chennai-9

2.The Joint Secretary to Government
Public, Law and Order Department
Secretariat, Chennai-9

3.The District Collector and
District Magistrate of Vellore District
Vellore-9

4.The Superintendent of Police
Vellore District, Vellore

5.The Superintendent of Prison
Central Prison, Vellore-2

6.The Inspector of Police
Ariyur Police Station
Vellore District

7.The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras

H.C.P.No.105 of 2021

NRL (CO)
EU 20/07/2021