



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 27.08.2021

Coram

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH
and
THE HONOURABLE MS. JUSTICE R.N.MANJULA

H.C.P.No.454 of 2021

K.Pachamuthu
S/o.Karuppaiyan

...Petitioner / Father of Detenue

Vs.

- 1.The State of Tamilnadu,
represented by Secretary to Government,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Ariyalur District, Ariyalur.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Ariyalur District, Ariyalur.
- 4.The Inspector of Police,
T.Palur Police Station,
Ariyalur District.
- 5.The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli. ...Respondents

Habeas Corpus Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus calling for the records in connection with the order of detention passed by the second respondent dated 07.02.2021 in Cr.M.P.No.03/2021 is TPDA No.9423 and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioner's son, viz., Ramanathan S/o.Pachamuthu, aged 20 years, residing at colony street, T.Palur Village and Post, Udayarpalayam Taluk, Ariyalur District, who is presently who is confined at Central Prison, Tiruchirappalli as Goonda under section 2(f) of Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Boot leggers, Drug offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 before this Court and set him at liberty.



WEB COPY

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Prabakaran

For Respondents : Mr.R.Muniyapparaj
Government Advocate [crl.side]

ORDER

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

The petitioner is the father of the detenu viz., Ramanathan S/o.Pachamuthu, aged 20 years. The detenu has been detained by the second respondent by his order in Cr.M.P.No.03/2021 dated 07.02.2021, 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] 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 07.02.2021. The petitioner made a representation on 15.03.2021. Thereafter, remarks were called for by the Government from the Detaining Authority on 16.03.2021. The remarks were duly received on 23.03.2021. 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 6 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority, of which 2 days were Government holidays and hence, there was a delay of 4 days in submitting the remarks by the



Detaining Authority. It is the further contention of the petitioner that the remarks were received on 23.03.2021 and there was a delay of 19 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 8 days were Government holidays. Hence, there was inordinate delay of 15 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.

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 4 days in submitting the remarks by the Detaining Authority and unexplained delay of 11 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 Cr.M.P.No.03/2021 dated 07.02.2021 passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Ramanathan S/o.Pachamuthu, aged 20 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-VI)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

gm



To

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

+1cc to Mr.C.Prabakaran, Advocate, S.R.No.43605

H.C.P.No.454 of 2021

SV-I (CO)
RVM(31/08/2021)